arXiv:1510.03929v4 [cs.PL] 13 Apr 2016

Type-Based Analysis for Session Inference (Extended Abstract)*

Carlo Spaccasassi and Vasileios Koutavas

Trinity College Dublin

Abstract. We propose a type-based analysis to infer the session protocols of channels in an ML-like concurrent functional language. Combining and extending well-known techniques, we develop a type-checking system that separates the underlying ML type system from the typing of sessions. Without using linearity, our system guarantees communication safety and partial lock freedom. It also supports provably complete session inference for finite sessions with no programmer annotations. We exhibit the usefulness of our system with interesting examples, including one which is not typable in substructural type systems.

1 Introduction

Concurrent programming often requires processes to communicate according to intricate protocols. In mainstream programming languages these protocols are encoded implicitly in the program's control flow, and no support is available for verifying their correctness.

Honda [6] first suggested the use of *binary session types* to explicitly describe and check protocols over communication channels with two endpoints. Fundamentally, session type systems guarantee that a program respects the order of communication events (session fidelity) and message types (communication safety) described in a channel's session type. A number of session type systems (e.g., [2, 3, 16]) also ensure that processes fully execute the protocols of their open endpoints, as long as they do not diverge or block on opening new sessions (partial lock freedom).

To date, binary session type disciplines have been developed for various process calculi and high-level programming languages (see [8] for an overview) by following one of two main programming language design approaches: using a single substructural type system for both session and traditional typing [5, 7, 18, 19], or using monads to separate the two [13, 16].

In this paper we propose a third design approach which uses *effects*. Similar to previous work, our approach enables the embedding of session types in programming languages with sophisticated type systems. Here we develop a high-level language where intricate protocols of communication can be programmed and checked statically (Sect. 2). Contrary to both monads and substructural type

* This research was supported, in part, by Science Foundation Ireland grant 13/RC/2094. The first author was supported by MSR (MRL 2011-039).

systems, our approach allows pure code to call library code with communication effects, without having to refactor the pure code (e.g., to embed it in a monad or pass continuation channels through it—see Ex. 2.3). We apply our approach to $\mathrm{ML_S}$, a core of ML with session communication (Sect. 3).

Our approach separates traditional typing from session typing in a two-level system, which follows the principles of *typed based analysis* [12]. The first level employs a type-and-effect system, which adapts and extends the one of Amtoft, Nielson and Nielson [1] to session communication (Sect. 4). At this level the program is typed against an ML type and a *behaviour* which abstractly describes program structure and communication. Session protocols are not considered here—they are entirely checked at the second level. Thus, each endpoint is given type Ses^{ρ}, where ρ statically approximates its source. The benefit of extending [1] is that we obtain a complete behaviour inference algorithm, which extracts a behaviour for every program respecting ML types.

At the second level, our system checks that a behaviour, given an operational semantics, complies with the session types of channels and endpoints (Sect. 5). The session discipline realised here is inspired by the work of Castagna et al. [3]. This discipline guarantees that programs comply with session fidelity and communication safety, but also, due to stacked interleaving of sessions, partial lock freedom. However, one of the main appeals of our session typing discipline is that it enables a provably *complete session types inference* from behaviours which, with behaviour inference, gives us a complete method for session inference from $\mathrm{ML_S}$, without programmer annotations (Sect. 6). The two levels of our system only interact through behaviours, which we envisage will allow us to develop front-ends for different languages and back-ends for different session disciplines.

To simplify the technical development we consider only sessions of finite interactions. However, we allow recursion in the source language, as long as it is *confined*: recursive code may only open new sessions and completely consume them (see Sect. 2). In Sect. 7 we discuss an extension to recursive types. Related work and conclusions can be found in Sect. 8. Details missing from this extended abstract can be found in the appendix for the benefit of the reviewers.

2 Motivating Examples

Example 2.1 (A Swap Service). A coordinator process uses the primitive acc-swp to accept two connections on a channel swp (we assume functions acc-c and req-c for every channel c), opening two concurrent sessions with processes that want to exchange values. It then coordinates the exchange and recurs.

```
let fun coord(_) =
  let val p1 = acc-swp ()
      val x1 = recv p1
      val p2 = acc-swp ()
      val x2 = recv p2
  in send p2 x1; send p1 x2; coord ()
in spawn coord;
```

```
let fun swap(x) =
  let val p = req-swp ()
  in send p x; recv p
in spawn (fn _ => swap 1);
   spawn (fn _ => swap 2);
```

Each endpoint the coordinator receives from calling acc-swp are used according to the session type $?T.!T.\mathsf{end}$. This says that, on each endpoint, the coordinator will first read a value type T ($?T$), then output a value of the same type ($!T$) and close the endpoint (end). The interleaving of sends and receives on the two endpoints achieves the desired swap effect.

Function swap : Int$\to T'$ calls req-swp and receives and endpoint which is used according to the session type $!\mathsf{Int}.?T'.\mathsf{end}$. By comparing the two session types above we can see that the coordinator and the swap service can communicate without type errors, and indeed are typable, when $T = \mathsf{Int} = T'$. Our type inference algorithm automatically deduces the two session types from this code.

Because swp is a global channel, ill-behaved client code can connect to it too:

```
let val p1 = req-swp () in send p1 1;
let val p2 = req-swp () in send p2 2;
let val (x1, x2) = (recv p1, recv p2) in e_cl
```

This client causes a deadlock, because the coordinator first sends on p2 and then on p1, but this code orders the corresponding receives in reverse. The interleaving of sessions in this client is rejected by our type system because it is not *well-stacked*: recv p1 is performed before the most recent endpoint (p2) is closed. The interleaving in the coordinator, on the other hand, is well-stacked.

Example 2.2 (Delegation for Efficiency).

In the previous example the coordinator is a bottleneck when exchanged values are large. A more efficient implementation delegates exchange to the clients:

```
let fun coord(_) =
  let val p1 = acc-swp ()
  in sel-SWAP p1;
    let val p2 = acc-swp
    in sel-LEAD p2;
       deleg p2 p1;
       coord()
```

```
let fun swap(x) =
  let val p = req-swp ()
  in case p {
    SWAP: send p x; recv p
    LEAD: let val q = resume p
              val y = recv q
          in send q x; y }
```

Function swap again connects to the coordinator over channel swp, but now offers two choices with the labels SWAP and LEAD. If the coordinator selects the former, the swap method proceeds as before; if it selects the latter, swap resumes (i.e., inputs) another endpoint, binds it to q, and performs a rcv and then a send on q. The new coordinator accepts two sessions on swp, receiving two endpoints: p1 and p2. It selects SWAP on p1, LEAD on p2, sends p1 over p2 and recurs.

When our system analyses the coordinator in isolation, it infers the protocol $\eta_{\mathsf{coord}} = (!\mathsf{SWAP}.\eta' \oplus !\mathsf{LEAD}.!\eta'.\mathsf{end})$ for both endpoints p1 and p2. When it analyses swap : $T_1 \to T_2$, it infers $\eta_{\mathsf{p}} = \Sigma\{?\mathsf{SWAP}.!T_1.?T_2.\mathsf{end},\ ?\mathsf{LEAD}.?\eta_{\mathsf{q}}.\mathsf{end}\}$ and $\eta_{\mathsf{q}} = ?T_2.!T_1.\mathsf{end}$ as the protocols of p and q, respectively. The former *selects* either options SWAP or LEAD and the latter *offers* both options.

If the coordinator is type-checked in isolation, then typing succeeds with any η': the coordinator can delegate any session. However, because of duality, the typing of req-swp in the swap function implies that $\eta' = \eta_{\mathsf{q}}$ and $T_1 = T_2$. Our inference algorithm can type this program and derive the above session types.

Example 2.3 (A Database Library). In this example we consider the implementation of a library which allows clients to connect to a database.

```
let fun coord(_) =
  let val p = acc-db ()
      fun loop(_) = case p {
        QRY: let val sql = recv p
                 val res = process sql
             in send p res; loop ()
        END: () }
  in spawn coord; loop ()
in spawn coord;
```

```
let fun clientinit (_) =
  let val con = req-db ()
      fun query(sql) = sel-QRY con;
                       send con sql;
                       recv con
      fun close(_) = sel-END con
  in (query, close)
in e_client
```

The coordinator accepts connections from clients on channel db. If a connection is established, after spawning a copy of the coordinator to serve other clients, the coordinator enters a loop that serves the connected client. In this loop it offers the client two options: QRY and END. If the client selects QRY, the coordinator receives an SQL query, processes it (calling process : sql $\to$ dbresult, with these types are defined in the library), sends back the result, and loops. If the client selects END the connection with the coordinator closes and the current coordinator process terminates.

Function clientinit is exposed to the client, which can use it to request a connection with the database coordinator. When called, it establishes a connection con and returns two functions to the client: query and close. Then, the client code e_{client} can apply the query function to an sql object and receive a dbresult as many times as necessary, and then invoke close to close the connection. Using our two-level inference system with recursion Sect. 7, we can infer the session type of the coordinator's endpoint p: $\mu X.\Sigma\{?\mathsf{QRY}.?\mathsf{sql}.!\mathsf{dbresult}.X,\ ?\mathsf{END}.\mathsf{end}\}$, and check whether the client code e_{client} respects it.

This example is not typable with a substructural type system because query and close share the same (linear) endpoint con. Moreover, in a monadic system e_{client} will need to be converted to monadic form.

3 Syntax and Operational Semantics of $\mathrm{ML_S}$

Fig. 1 shows the syntax and operational semantics of $\mathrm{ML_S}$, a core of ML with session communication. An expression can be one of the usual lambda expressions or spawn e which evaluates e to a function and asynchronously applies it to the unit value; it can also be case $e\,\{L_i : e_i\}_{i\in I}$ which, as we will see, implements finite *external choice*. We use standard syntactic sugar for writing programs. A *system* S is a parallel composition of closed expressions *(processes)*.

The operational semantics of $\mathrm{ML_S}$ are standard; here we only discuss session-related rules. Following the tradition of binary session types [7], communication between processes happens over dynamically generated entities called *sessions* which have exactly two *endpoints*. Thus, $\mathrm{ML_S}$ values contain a countably infinite set of endpoints, ranged over by p. We assume a total involution $(\overline{\cdot})$ over this set, with the property $\overline{p} \neq p$, which identifies *dual endpoints*.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\textbf{Exp:} & e ::= v \mid (e,e) \mid e\,e \mid \mathsf{let}\,x = e\,\mathsf{in}\,e \mid \mathsf{if}\,e\,\mathsf{then}\,e\,\mathsf{else}\,e \mid \mathsf{spawn}\,e \mid \mathsf{case}\,e\,\{L_i : e_i\}_{i\in I} \\
\textbf{Sys:} & S ::= e \mid S \parallel S \\
\textbf{Val:} & v ::= x \mid k \in \mathsf{Const} \mid (v,v) \mid \mathsf{fn}\,x \Rightarrow e \mid \mathsf{fun}\,f(x) = e \mid p \\
 & \quad \mid \mathsf{req}\text{-}c \mid \mathsf{acc}\text{-}c \mid \mathsf{send} \mid \mathsf{recv} \mid \mathsf{sel}\text{-}L \mid \mathsf{deleg} \mid \mathsf{resume} \\
\textbf{ECxt:} & E ::= [\cdot] \mid (E,e) \mid (v,E) \mid E\,e \mid v\,E \mid \mathsf{let}\,x = E\,\mathsf{in}\,e \mid \mathsf{if}\,E\,\mathsf{then}\,e\,\mathsf{else}\,e \\
 & \quad \mid \mathsf{spawn}\,E \mid \mathsf{case}\,E\,\{L_i : e_i\}_{i\in I}
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\textsc{RIft} & \mathsf{if\,tt\,then}\,e_1\,\mathsf{else}\,e_2 \hookrightarrow e_1 & \qquad \textsc{RLet} \quad \mathsf{let}\,x = v\,\mathsf{in}\,e \hookrightarrow e[v/x] \\
\textsc{RIff} & \mathsf{if\,ff\,then}\,e_1\,\mathsf{else}\,e_2 \hookrightarrow e_2 & \qquad \textsc{RFix} \quad (\mathsf{fun}\,f(x) = e)\,v \hookrightarrow e[\mathsf{fun}\,f(x) = e/f][v/x]
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\textsc{RBeta} & E[e] \parallel S \longrightarrow E[e'] \parallel S & \text{if } e \hookrightarrow e' \\
\textsc{RSpn} & E[\mathsf{spawn}\,v] \parallel S \longrightarrow E[()] \parallel v\,() \parallel S & \\
\textsc{RInit} & E_1[\mathsf{req}\text{-}c\,()] \parallel E_2[\mathsf{acc}\text{-}c\,()] \parallel S \longrightarrow E_1[p] \parallel E_2[\overline{p}] \parallel S & \text{if } p, \overline{p} \text{ fresh} \\
\textsc{RCom} & E_1[\mathsf{send}\,(p,v)] \parallel E_2[\mathsf{recv}\,\overline{p}] \parallel S \longrightarrow E_1[()] \parallel E_2[v] \parallel S & \\
\textsc{RDel} & E_1[\mathsf{deleg}\,(p,p')] \parallel E_2[\mathsf{resume}\,\overline{p}] \parallel S \longrightarrow E_1[()] \parallel E_2[p'] \parallel S & \\
\textsc{RSel} & E_1[\mathsf{sel}\text{-}L_j\,p] \parallel E_2[\mathsf{case}\,\overline{p}\,\{L_i : e_i\}_{i\in I}] \parallel S \longrightarrow E_1[()] \parallel E_2[e_j] \parallel S & \text{if } j \in I
\end{array}
$$

Fig. 1. $\mathrm{ML_S}$ syntax and operational semantics.

A process can request (or accept) a new session by calling $\mathsf{req}\text{-}c$ (resp., $\mathsf{acc}\text{-}c$) with the unit value, which returns the endpoint (resp., dual endpoint) of a new session. Here c ranges over an infinite set of global initialisation *channels*. To simplify presentation, the language contains $\mathsf{req}\text{-}c$ and $\mathsf{acc}\text{-}c$ for each channel c.

Once two processes synchronise on a global channel and each receives a fresh, dual endpoint (RInit reduction), they can exchange messages (RCom), *delegate* endpoints (RDel) and offer a number of choices $L_{i\in I}$, from which the partner can select one (RSel). Here L ranges over a countably infinite set of choice labels, and I is a finite set of natural numbers; L_i denotes a unique label for each natural number i and we assume $\mathsf{sel}\text{-}L_i$ for each L_i.

The next two sections present the two-level type system of $\mathrm{ML_S}$.

4 First Level Typing: ML Typing and Behaviours

Here we adapt and extend the type-and-effect system of Amtoft, Nielson and Nielson [1] to session communication in $\mathrm{ML_S}$. A judgement $C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : T \triangleright b$ states that e has type T and behaviour b, under type environment Γ and *constraint environment* C. The constraint environment relates type-level variables to terms and enables type inference. These components are defined in Fig. 2.

An $\mathrm{ML_S}$ expression can have a standard type or an endpoint type Ses^{ρ}. Function types are annotated with a behaviour variable β. *Type variables* α are used for ML polymorphism. As in [1], Hindley-Milner polymorphism is extended with type schemas TS of the form $\forall(\vec{\gamma}{:}C_0).\,T$, where γ ranges over variables $\alpha, \beta, \rho, \psi$, and C_0 imposes constraints on the quantified variables with $\mathrm{fv}(C_0) \subseteq \{\vec{\gamma}\}$. Type environments Γ bind program variables to type schemas; we let $\forall(\emptyset).T = T$.

The rules of our type-and-effect system are shown in Fig. 3 which, as in [1, Sec. 2.8], is a conservative extension of ML. This system performs both ML

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
\textbf{Variables:} & \alpha\textbf{(Type)} \quad \beta\textbf{(Behaviour)} \quad \psi\textbf{(Session)} \quad \rho\textbf{(Region)} \\
\textbf{T. Schemas:} & TS ::= \forall(\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}\vec{\rho}\vec{\psi} : C).\, T \qquad\qquad \textbf{Regions:}\ \ r ::= l \mid \rho \\
\textbf{Types:} & T ::= \mathsf{Unit} \mid \mathsf{Bool} \mid \mathsf{Int} \mid T \times T \mid T \xrightarrow{\beta} T \mid \mathsf{Ses}^{\rho} \mid \alpha \\
\textbf{Constraints:} & C ::= T \subseteq T \mid \mathit{cfd}(T) \mid b \subseteq \beta \mid \rho \sim r \mid c \sim \eta \mid \overline{c} \sim \eta \mid \eta \bowtie \eta \mid C, C \mid \epsilon \\
\textbf{Behaviours:} & b ::= \beta \mid \tau \mid b\,;b \mid b \oplus b \mid \mathsf{rec}_{\beta}\, b \mid \mathsf{spawn}\, b \mid \mathsf{push}(l : \eta) \\
 & \quad \mid \rho!T \mid \rho?T \mid \rho!\rho \mid \rho?l \mid \rho!L_i \mid \underset{i \in I}{\&}\{\rho?L_i\,;b_i\} \\
\textbf{Type Envs:} & \Gamma ::= x : TS \mid \Gamma, \Gamma \mid \epsilon
\end{array}
$$

Fig. 2. Syntax of types, behaviours, constraints, and session types.

type checking (including type-schema inference), and behaviour checking (which enables behaviour inference). Rules TLet, TVar, TIf, TConst, TApp, TFun, TSpawn and the omitted rule for pairs perform standard type checking and straightforward sequential ($b_1\,;b_2$) and non-deterministic ($b_1 \oplus b_2$) behaviour composition; τ is the behaviour with no effect.

Just as a type constraint $T \subseteq \alpha$ associates type T with type variable α, a behaviour constraint $b \subseteq \beta$ associated behaviour b to behaviour variable β. Intuitively, β is the non-deterministic composition of all its associated behaviours. Rule TSub allows the replacement of behaviour b with variable β; such replacement in type annotations yields a subtyping relation ($C \vdash T <: T'$). Rules TIns and TGen are taken from [1] and extend ML's type schema instantiation and generalisation rules, respectively. Because we extend Hindley-Milner's let polymorphism, generalisation (TGen) is only applied to the right-hand side expression of the let construct. The following definition allows the instantiation of a type schema under a global constraint environment C. We write $C \vdash C'$ when C' is included in the reflexive, transitive, compatible closure of C.

Definition 4.1 (Solvability). $\forall(\vec{\gamma} : C_0).\, T$ *is* solvable *by* C *and substitution* σ *when* $\mathit{dom}(\sigma) \subseteq \{\vec{\gamma}\}$ *and* $C \vdash C_0\sigma$.

In TRec, the communication effect of the body of a recursive function should be *confined*, which means it may only use endpoints it opens internally. For this reason, the function does not input nor return open endpoints or other non-confined functions ($C \vdash \mathit{confd}(T, T')$). Although typed under Γ which may contain endpoints and non-confined functions, the effect of the function body is recorded in its behaviour. The second level of our system checks that if the function is called, no endpoints from its environment are affected. It also checks that the function fully consumes internal endpoints before it returns or recurs.

A type T is confined when it does not contain any occurrences of the endpoint type Ses^{ρ} for any ρ, and when any b in T is confined. A behaviour b is confined when all of its possible behaviours are either τ or recursive.

To understand rule TEndp, we have to explain region variables (ρ), which are related to region constants through C. Region constants are simple program annotations l (produced during pre-processing) which uniquely identify the textual

$$\textsc{TLet}\ \frac{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e_1 : TS \triangleright b_1 \quad C;\ \Gamma, x : TS \vdash e_2 : T \triangleright b_2}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{let}\, x = e_1\, \mathsf{in}\, e_2 : T \triangleright b_1 ; b_2}$$

$$\textsc{TVar}\ \ C;\ \Gamma \vdash x : \Gamma(x) \triangleright \tau$$

$$\textsc{TIf}\ \frac{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \mathsf{Bool} \triangleright b_1 \quad C;\ \Gamma \vdash e_i : T \triangleright b_i\ \ (i \in \{1,2\})}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{if}\, e_1\, \mathsf{then}\, e_2\, \mathsf{else}\, e_3 : T \triangleright b_1 ; (b_2 \oplus b_3)}$$

$$\textsc{TConst}\ \ C;\ \Gamma \vdash k : \mathit{typeof}(k) \triangleright \tau$$

$$\textsc{TApp}\ \frac{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e_1 : T' \xrightarrow{\beta} T \triangleright b_1 \quad C;\ \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T' \triangleright b_2}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e_1\, e_2 : T \triangleright b_1 ; b_2 ; \beta}$$

$$\textsc{TFun}\ \frac{C;\ \Gamma, x : T \vdash e : T' \triangleright \beta}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{fn}\, x \Rightarrow e : T \xrightarrow{\beta} T' \triangleright \tau}$$

$$\textsc{TMatch}\ \frac{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : \mathsf{Ses}^{\rho} \triangleright b \quad C;\ \Gamma \vdash e_i : T \triangleright b_i\ \ (i \in I)}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{case}\, e\, \{L_i : e_i\}_{i \in I} : T \triangleright b ; \underset{i \in I}{\&} \{\rho ? L_i ; b_i\}}$$

$$\textsc{TEndp}\ \ C;\ \Gamma \vdash p^l : \mathsf{Ses}^{\rho} \triangleright \tau \quad C \vdash \rho \sim l$$

$$\textsc{TSub}\ \frac{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : T \triangleright b}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : T' \triangleright \beta} \quad \begin{array}{l} C \vdash T <: T' \\ C \vdash b \subseteq \beta \end{array}$$

$$\textsc{TSpawn}\ \frac{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : \mathsf{Unit} \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathsf{Unit} \triangleright b}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{spawn}\, e : \mathsf{Unit} \triangleright b ; \mathsf{spawn}\, \beta}$$

$$\textsc{TRec}\ \frac{C;\ \Gamma, f : T \xrightarrow{\beta} T', x : T \vdash e : T' \triangleright b}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{fun}\, f(x) = e : T \xrightarrow{\beta} T' \triangleright \tau} \quad \begin{array}{l} C \vdash \mathit{confd}(T, T') \\ C \vdash \mathsf{rec}_{\beta}\, b \subseteq \beta \end{array}$$

$$\textsc{TIns}\ \frac{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : \forall(\vec{\gamma} : C_0).T \triangleright b}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : T\sigma \triangleright b} \quad \begin{array}{l} \mathit{dom}(\sigma) \subseteq \{\vec{\gamma}\} \\ \forall(\vec{\gamma} : C_0).\, T \text{ is solvable by } C \text{ and } \sigma \end{array}$$

$$\textsc{TGen}\ \frac{C \cup C_0;\ \Gamma \vdash e : T \triangleright b}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : \forall(\vec{\gamma} : C_0).T \triangleright b} \quad \begin{array}{l} \{\vec{\gamma}\} \cap \mathrm{fv}(\Gamma, C, b) = \emptyset \\ \forall(\vec{\gamma} : C_0).T \text{ is solvable by } C \text{ and some } \sigma \end{array}$$

Fig. 3. Type-and-Effect System for $\mathrm{ML_S}$ Expressions (omitting rule for pairs).

sources of endpoints. We thus type an extended $\mathrm{ML_S}$ syntax

$$\textbf{Values:} \qquad v ::= \ldots \mid p^l \mid \mathsf{req}\text{-}c^l \mid \mathsf{acc}\text{-}c^l \mid \mathsf{resume}^l$$

If a sub-expression has type Ses^{ρ} and it evaluates to a value p^l, then it must be that $C \vdash \rho \sim l$, denoting that p was generated from the code location identified by l. This location will contain one of $\mathsf{req}\text{-}c^l$, $\mathsf{acc}\text{-}c^l$, or resume^l. These primitive functions (typed by TConst) are given the following type schemas.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathsf{req}\text{-}c^l & : \forall(\beta\rho\psi : \mathsf{push}(l : \psi) \subseteq \beta, \rho \sim l, c \sim \psi).\, \mathsf{Unit} \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathsf{Ses}^{\rho} \\ \mathsf{acc}\text{-}c^l & : \forall(\beta\rho\psi : \mathsf{push}(l : \psi) \subseteq \beta, \rho \sim l, \overline{c} \sim \psi).\, \mathsf{Unit} \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathsf{Ses}^{\rho} \\ \mathsf{resume}^l & : \forall(\beta\rho\rho' : \rho ? l \subseteq \beta,\ \ \rho' \sim l).\, \mathsf{Ses}^{\rho} \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathsf{Ses}^{\rho'} \end{array}$$

An application of $\mathsf{req}\text{-}c^l$ starts a new session on the static endpoint l. To type it, C must contain its effect $\mathsf{push}(l : \psi) \subseteq \beta$, where ψ is a session variable, representing the session type of l. At this level session types are ignored (hence the use of a simple ψ); they become important in the second level of our typing system. Moreover, C must record that session variable ρ is related to l ($\rho \sim l$) and that the "request" endpoint of channel c has session type ψ ($c \sim \psi$). The

only difference in the type schema of $\mathsf{acc}\text{-}c^l$ is that the "accept" endpoint of c is related to ψ ($\overline{c} \sim \psi$). Resume receives an endpoint (ρ') over another one (ρ), recorded in its type schema ($\rho?\rho' \subseteq \beta$); ρ is an existing endpoint but ρ' is treated as an endpoint generated by resume^l, hence the constraint $\rho' \sim l$.

The following are the type schemas of the rest of the constant functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{recv} &: \forall(\alpha\beta\rho : \rho?\alpha \subseteq \beta, \mathit{cfd}(\alpha)).\, \mathsf{Ses}^\rho \xrightarrow{\beta} \alpha \\
\mathsf{send} &: \forall(\alpha\beta\rho : \rho!\alpha \subseteq \beta, \mathit{cfd}(\alpha)).\, \mathsf{Ses}^\rho \times \alpha \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathsf{Unit} \\
\mathsf{deleg} &: \forall(\beta\rho\rho' : \rho!\rho' \subseteq \beta).\, \mathsf{Ses}^\rho \times \mathsf{Ses}^{\rho'} \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathsf{Unit} \\
\mathsf{sel}\text{-}L &: \forall(\beta\rho : \rho?L \subseteq \beta).\, \mathsf{Ses}^\rho \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathsf{Unit}
\end{aligned}$$

These record input ($\rho?\alpha$), output ($\rho!\alpha$), delegation ($\rho!\rho'$), or selection ($\rho!L_i$) behaviour. For input and output the constraint $\mathit{cfd}(\alpha)$ must be in C, recording that the α can be instantiated only with confined types.

5 Second Level Typing: Session Types

Session types describe the communication protocols of endpoints; their syntax is:

$$\eta ::= \mathsf{end} \mid !T.\eta \mid ?T.\eta \mid !\eta.\eta \mid ?\eta.\eta \mid \bigoplus_{i\in I}\{L_i : \eta_i\} \mid \&\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i\in(I_1,I_2)} \mid \psi$$

A session type is finished (end) or it can describe further interactions: the input ($?T.\eta$) or output ($!T.\eta$) of a *confined* value T, or the delegation ($!\eta'.\eta$) or resumption ($?\eta'.\eta$) of an endpoint of session type η', or the offering of non-deterministic selection ($\oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i\in I}$) of a label L_i, signifying that session type η_i is to be followed next.

Moreover, a session type can offer an external choice $\&\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i\in(I_1,I_2)}$ to its communication partner. Here I_1 contains the labels that the process *must* be able to accept and I_2 the labels that it *may* accept. We require that I_1 and I_2 are disjoint and I_1 is not empty. Although a single set would suffice, the two sets make type inference deterministic and independent of source code order.

We express our session typing discipline as an *abstract interpretation semantics* for behaviours shown in Fig. 4. It describes transitions of the form $\Delta \vDash b \to_C \Delta' \vDash b'$, where b, b' are behaviours. The Δ and Δ' are stacks on which static endpoint labels together with their corresponding session types ($l : \eta$) can be pushed and popped. Inspired by Castagna et al. [3], in the transition $\Delta \vDash b \to_C \Delta' \vDash b'$, behaviour b can only use the top label in the stack to communicate, push another label on the stack, or pop the top label provided its session type is end. This stack principle gives us a partial lock freedom property (Cor. A.1).

Rule End from Fig. 4 simply removes a finished stack frame, and rule Beta looks up behaviour variables in C; Plus chooses one of the branches of non-deterministic behaviour. The Push rule extends the stack by adding one more frame to it, as long as the label has not been added before on the stack (see Ex. 5.2). Rules Out and In reduce the top-level session type of the stack by an output and input, respectively. The requirement here is that the labels in the

$$
\begin{array}{lrll}
\textsc{End}: & (l:\mathsf{end})\cdot\Delta \vDash b \to_C \Delta \vDash b & & \\
\textsc{Beta}: & \Delta \vDash \beta \to_C \Delta \vDash b & & \text{if } C \vdash b \subseteq \beta \\
\textsc{Plus}: & \Delta \vDash b_1 \oplus b_2 \to_C \Delta \vDash b_i & & \text{if } i \in \{1,2\} \\
\textsc{Push}: & \Delta \vDash \mathsf{push}(l:\eta) \to_C (l:\eta)\cdot\Delta \vDash \tau & & \text{if } l \notin \Delta.\mathsf{labels} \\
\textsc{Out}: & (l:!T.\eta)\cdot\Delta \vDash \rho!T' \to_C (l:\eta)\cdot\Delta \vDash \tau & & \text{if } C \vdash \rho \sim l,\ T' <: T \\
\textsc{In}: & (l:?T.\eta)\cdot\Delta \vDash \rho?T' \to_C (l:\eta)\cdot\Delta \vDash \tau & & \text{if } C \vdash \rho \sim l,\ T <: T' \\
\textsc{Del}: & (l:!\eta_d.\eta)\cdot(l_d:\eta'_d)\cdot\Delta \vDash \rho!\rho_d & & \\
 & \to_C (l:\eta)\cdot\Delta \vDash \tau & & \text{if } C \vdash \rho \sim l,\ \rho_d \sim l_d,\ \eta'_d <: \eta_d \\
\textsc{Res}: & (l:?\eta_r.\eta) \vDash \rho?l_r \to_C (l:\eta)\cdot(l_r:\eta_r) \vDash \tau & & \text{if } (l \neq l_r),\ C \vdash \rho \sim l \\
\textsc{Ich}: & (l:\bigoplus_{i\in I}\{L_i:\eta_i\})\cdot\Delta \vDash \rho!L_j \to_C (l:\eta_j)\cdot\Delta \vDash \tau & & \text{if } (j \in I),\ C \vdash \rho \sim l \\
\textsc{Ech}: & (l:\&_{i\in(I_1,I_2)}\{L_i:\eta_i\})\cdot\Delta \vDash \&_{j\in J}\{\rho?L_j\,;b_j\} & & \\
 & \to_C (l:\eta_k)\cdot\Delta \vDash b_k & & \text{if } k \in J,\ C \vdash \rho \sim l, \\
 & & & \quad I_1 \subseteq J \subseteq I_1 \cup I_2 \\
\textsc{Rec}: & \Delta \vDash \mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b \to_C \Delta \vDash \tau & & \text{if } \epsilon \vDash b \Downarrow_{C'}, \\
 & & & C' = (C \backslash (\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b \subseteq \beta)) \cup (\tau \subseteq \beta) \\
\textsc{Spn}: & \Delta \vDash \mathsf{spawn}\, b \to_C \Delta \vDash \tau & & \text{if } \epsilon \vDash b \Downarrow_C \\
\textsc{Seq}: & \Delta \vDash b_1\,;b_2 \to_C \Delta' \vDash b'_1\,;b_2 & & \text{if } \Delta \vDash b_1 \to_C \Delta' \vDash b'_1 \\
\textsc{Tau}: & \Delta \vDash \tau\,;b \to_C \Delta \vDash b & &
\end{array}
$$

Fig. 4. Abstract Interpretation Semantics.

stack and the behaviour match, the usual subtyping [4] holds for the communicated types, and that the communicated types are *confined*. Note that sending confined (recursive) functions does not require delegation of endpoints.

Transfer of endpoints is done by delegate and resume (rules Del and Res). Delegate sends the second endpoint in the stack over the first; resume mimics this by adding a new endpoint label in the second position in the stack. Resume requires a one-frame stack to guarantee that the two endpoints of the same session do not end up in the same stack, thus avoiding deadlock [3]. If we abandon the partial lock freedom property guaranteed by our type system, then the conditions in Res can be relaxed and allow more than one frame.

A behaviour reduces an internal choice session type by selecting one of its labels (Ich). A behaviour offering an external choice is reduced non-deterministically to any of its branches (Ech). The behaviour must offer all *active* choices ($I_1 \subseteq J$) and all behaviour branches must be typable by the session type ($J \subseteq I_1 \cup I_2$).

As we previously explained, recursive functions in $\mathrm{ML_S}$ must be confined. This means that the communication effect of the function body is only on endpoints that the function opens internally, and the session type of these endpoints is followed to completion (or delegated) before the function returns or recurs. This is enforced in Rule Rec, where $\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b$ must have no net effect on the stack, guaranteed by $\epsilon \vDash b \Downarrow_{C'}$. Here $C' = (C \backslash (\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b \subseteq \beta)) \cup (\tau \subseteq \beta)$ is the original C with constraint $(\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b \subseteq \beta)$ replaced by $(\tau \subseteq \beta)$ (cf., Def. 5.1). This update

(a)
```
let val (p1, p2) = (req-c^l1, req-d^l2)
    val p3 = if e then p1 else p2
in send p3 tt
```

(b)
```
let fun f  = req-c^l
    val p1 = f ()
in send p1 1;
   let val p2 = f () in send p1 2;
```

Fig. 5. Examples of aliasing

of C prevents the infinite unfolding of $\mathsf{rec}_b\,\beta$. Spawned processes must also be confined (Spn). We work with *well-formed* constraints:

Definition 5.1 (Well-Formed Constraints). *C is* well-formed *if:*

1. Type-Consistent: *for all type constructors tc_1, tc_2, if $(tc_1(\vec{t_1}) \subseteq tc_2(\vec{t_2})) \in C$, then $tc_1 = tc_2$, and for all $t_{1i} \in \vec{t_1}$ and $t_{2i} \in \vec{t_2}$, $(t_{1i} \subseteq t_{2i}) \in C$.*
2. Region-Consistent: *if $C \vdash l \sim l'$ then $l = l'$.*
3. Behaviour-Compact: *behaviour constraints cycles contain a $(\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b \subseteq \beta) \in C$; also if $(\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b \subseteq \beta') \in C$ then $\beta = \beta'$ and $\forall (b' \subseteq \beta) \in C$, $b' = \mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b$.*
4. Well-Confined: *if $C \vdash confd(T)$ then $T \neq \mathsf{Ses}^\rho$; also if $C \vdash confd(b)$ then $b \notin \{\rho!T, \rho?T, \rho!\rho, \rho?l, \rho!L_i, \underset{i\in I}{\&}\{\rho?L_i\,; b_i\}\}$.*

The first and fourth conditions are straightforward. The third condition disallows recursive behaviours through the environment without the use of a $\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b$ effect. All well-typed $\mathrm{ML_S}$ programs contain only such recursive behaviours because recursion is only possible through the use of a recursive function. The second part of the condition requires that there is at most one recursive constraint in the environment using variable β. This is necessary for type preservation and decidability of session typing. The second condition of Def. 5.1 requires that only endpoints from a single source can flow in each ρ, preventing aliasing of endpoints generated at different source locations.

Example 5.1 (Aliasing of Different Sources). Consider the program in Fig. 5 (a). Which endpoint flows to p3 cannot be statically determined and therefore the program cannot yield a consistent session type for channels c and d. The program will be rejected in our framework because p3 has type Ses^ρ and from the constrain environment $C \vdash \rho \sim l_1,\ \rho \sim l_2$, which fails Def. 5.1.

Because endpoints generated from the same source code location are identified in our system, stacks are treated *linearly*: an endpoint label l may only once be pushed onto a stack. Every stack Δ contains an implicit set of the labels $\Delta.\mathsf{labels}$ to record previously pushed labels.

Example 5.2 (Aliasing From Same Source). Consider the program in Fig. 5 (b) where endpoint p1 has type Ses^ρ, with $C \vdash \rho \sim l$. The program has behaviour $\mathsf{push}(l : \eta); \rho!\mathsf{Int}; \mathsf{push}(l : \eta); \rho!\mathsf{Int}; \tau$. Label l is pushed on the stack twice and the behaviour complies with the session type $\eta = !\mathsf{Int}.\mathsf{end}$. However the program does not respect this session type because it sends two integers on p1 and none on p2. Our system rejects this program due to the violation of stack linearity.

Our system also rejects the correct version of the program in Fig. 5 (b), where the last send is replaced by $\mathsf{send\ p2\ 2}$. This is because the label l associated with the variable ρ of a type Ses^{ρ} is *control flow insensitive*. Existing techniques can make labels control flow sensitive (e.g., [14, 15]).

Using the semantics of Fig. 4 we define the following predicate which requires behaviours to follow to completion or delegate all $(l : \eta)$ frames in a stack.

Definition 5.2 (Strong normalization). *$\Delta \vDash b \Downarrow_C \vec{\Delta'}$ when for all b', Δ' such that $\Delta \vDash b \rightarrow_C^* \Delta' \vDash b' \not\rightarrow_C$ we have $b' = \tau$ and $\Delta' \in \{\vec{\Delta'}\}$. We write $\Delta \vDash b \Downarrow_C$ when $\Delta \vDash b \Downarrow_C \epsilon$, where ϵ is the empty stack.*

Lastly, session types on dual session endpoints ($c \sim \eta$, $\overline{c} \sim \eta'$) must be dual ($C \vdash \eta \bowtie \eta'$) The definition of duality is standard, with the exception that internal choice is dual to external choice only if the labels in the former are included in the *active* labels in the latter.

Definition 5.3 (Valid Constraint Environment). *C is* valid *if there exists a substitution σ of variables ψ with closed session types, such that $C\sigma$ is well-formed and for all $(c \sim \eta), (\overline{c} \sim \eta') \in C\sigma$ we have $C \vdash \eta \bowtie \eta'$.*

Combining the Two Levels

The key property here is *well-stackedness*, the fact that in a running system where each process has a corresponding stack of endpoints, there is a way to repeatedly remove pairs of endpoints with dual session types from the top of two stacks, until all stacks are empty.

Definition 5.4 (Well-stackedness). *$C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{S}$ is the least relation satisfying:*

$$\frac{}{C \Vdash_{ws} \epsilon} \qquad \frac{C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{S},\ \big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big),\ \big(\Delta' \vDash b',\ e'\big) \qquad C \vdash \eta \bowtie \eta' \qquad p, \overline{p} \sharp \Delta, \Delta', \mathcal{S}}{C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{S}, \big((p^l : \eta) \cdot \Delta \vDash b,\ e\big), \big((\overline{p}^{l'} : \eta') \cdot \Delta' \vDash b',\ e'\big)}$$

Note that this does not mean that programs are deterministic. Multiple pairs of endpoints may be at the top of a set of stacks. Duality of endpoints guarantees that communications are safe; the ordering of endpoints in removable pairs implies the absence of deadlocks.

We let P, Q range over tuples of the form $\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big)$ and $\mathcal{S}$ over sequences of such tuples. In this section stack frames $(p^l : \eta)$ store both endpoints and their labels. We write $C \Vdash \overrightarrow{\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big)}$ if C is well-formed and valid, $(C;\ \emptyset \vdash \overrightarrow{e : T \triangleright b})$, and $(\overrightarrow{\Delta \vDash b} \Downarrow_C)$, for some $\overrightarrow{T}$. We write $C \Vdash_{\mathsf{ws}} \mathcal{S}$ if $\overrightarrow{\Delta}$ is well-stacked. Well-typed systems enjoy session fidelity and preserve typing and well-stackedness.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{S} = \overrightarrow{\Delta \vDash b, e}$ and $C \Vdash \mathcal{S}$ and $C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{S}$ and $\overrightarrow{e} \longrightarrow \overrightarrow{e}'$; then there exist $\overrightarrow{\Delta}'$, $\overrightarrow{b}'$ such that $\mathcal{S}' = \overrightarrow{\big(\Delta' \vDash b',\ e'\big)}$ and:*

1. *$C \Vdash \mathcal{S}'$* *(Type Preservation)*
2. *$\overrightarrow{\Delta \vDash b} \rightarrow_C^* \overrightarrow{\Delta' \vDash b'}$* *(Session Fidelity)*
3. *$C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{S}'$* *(Well-Stackedness Preservation)*

Session fidelity and well-stackedness preservation imply *communication safety*, since the former guarantees that processes are faithful to session types in the stacks, while the latter that session types are dual for each pair of open endpoints p and $\bar{p}$. Moreover, well-stackedness implies *deadlock freedom*. P *depends on* Q if the endpoint at the top of P's stack has dual endpoint in Q.

Lemma 5.1 (Deadlock Freedom). *$C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{S}$; dependencies in $\mathcal{S}$ are acyclic.*

Type soundness is more technical. We divide system transitions to communication transitions between processes ($\longrightarrow_{\mathsf{c}}$) and internal transitions ($\longrightarrow_{\mathsf{i}}$). Let $\mathcal{S} \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{c}} \mathcal{S}'$ ($\mathcal{S} \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{i}} \mathcal{S}'$) when $S \longrightarrow S'$, derived by Rule RInit, RCom, RDel or RSel of Fig. 1 (resp., any other rule); $S \Longrightarrow_{\mathsf{c}} S'$ when $S \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{i}}^{*} \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{c}} \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{i}}^{*} S'$.

Theorem 5.2 (Type Soundness). *Let $C \Vdash \mathcal{S}$ and $C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{S}$. Then*

1. *$\mathcal{S} \Longrightarrow_{\mathsf{c}} \mathcal{S}'$, or*
2. *$\mathcal{S} \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{i}}^{*} (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{B})$ such that:*
   Finished processes, $\mathcal{F}$: *$\forall P \in \mathcal{F}.\ P = \big(\epsilon \vDash \tau,\ v\big)$, for some v;*
   Diverging processes, $\mathcal{D}$: *$\forall P \in \mathcal{D}.\ P \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{i}}^{\infty}$;*
   Waiting proc., $\mathcal{W}$: *$\forall P \in \mathcal{W}.\ P = \big(\Delta \vDash b,\ E[e]\big)$ and $e \in \{\mathsf{req}\text{-}c^{l}, \mathsf{acc}\text{-}c^{l}\}$;*
   Blocked processes, $\mathcal{B}$: *$\forall P \in \mathcal{B}.\ P = \big(\Delta \vDash b,\ E[e]\big)$ and $e \in \{\mathsf{send}\, v, \mathsf{recv}\, v,$ $\mathsf{deleg}\ v, \mathsf{resume}\, v, \mathsf{sel}\text{-}L\, v, \mathsf{case}\, v\, \{L_i \Rightarrow e_i\}_{i \in I}\}$ and P transitively depends on a process in $\mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{W}$.*

A well-typed and well-stacked $\mathrm{ML_S}$ system will either be able to perform a communication, or, after finite internal steps, it will reach a state where some processes are values ($\mathcal{F}$), some internally diverge ($\mathcal{D}$), some are waiting for a partner process to open a session ($\mathcal{W}$), and some are blocked on a session communication ($\mathcal{B}$). Crucially, in states where communication is not possible, $\mathcal{B}$ transitively depends on $\mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{W}$. Thus, in the absence of divergence and in the presence of enough processes to start new sessions, no processes can be blocked; the system will either perform a communication or it will terminate *(partial lock freedom)*.

Corollary 5.1 (Partial Lock Freedom). *If $C \Vdash \mathcal{S}$, $C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{S}$, and $\mathcal{S} \not\Longrightarrow_{\mathsf{c}}$ and $\mathcal{S} \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{i}}^{*} (\mathcal{F}, \emptyset, \emptyset, \mathcal{B})$ then $\mathcal{B} = \emptyset$.*

6 Inference Algorithm

We use three inference algorithms, $\mathcal{W}$, $\mathcal{SI}$ and $\mathcal{D}$. The first infers functional types and communication effects and corresponds to the first level of our type system. The other two infer session types from the abstract interpretation rules of Fig. 4 ($\mathcal{SI}$) and the duality requirement of Def. 5.3 ($\mathcal{D}$), corresponding to the second level of the type system.

Algorithm $\mathcal{W}$ is a straightforward adaptation of the homonymous algorithm from [1]: given an expression e, $\mathcal{W}$ calculates its type t, behaviour b and constraints set C; no session information is calculated. $\mathcal{W}$ generates pairs of fresh constraints $c \sim \psi$ and $\overline{c} \sim \psi'$ for each global channel c in the source program; ψ and ψ' are unique. Results of $\mathcal{W}$'s soundness and completeness follow from [1].

For all constraints $(c \sim \psi) \in C$, Algorithm $\mathcal{SI}$ infers a substitution σ and a refined set C' such that $\epsilon \vDash b\sigma \Downarrow_{C'} \epsilon$. The substitution only maps ψ variables to session types. The final C' is derived from C by applying σ and possibly adding more type constraints of the form $(T \subseteq T')$. The core of this algorithm is the abstract interpreter $\mathcal{MC}$, which explores all possible transitions from $\epsilon \vDash b$.

Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ is designed in a continuation-passing style, using a *continuation stack* $K ::= \epsilon \mid b \cdot K$.

As transition paths are explored, previously discovered branches of internal and external choices in session types may need to be expanded. For example, if Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ encounters a configuration $(l : \oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in I}) \vDash l!L_j$ where $j \notin I$, the inference algorithm needs to add the newly discovered label L_j to the internal choice on the stack.

To do this, internal and external choices are removed from the syntax of sessions, and replaced with special variables ψ_{in} and ψ_{ex}. These variables are bound by unique *choice constraints*, extending the syntax of constraints (Fig. 2):

$$C ::= \ldots \mid \oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in I} \sim \psi_{\mathsf{in}} \mid \&\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in (I_1, I_2)} \sim \psi_{\mathsf{ex}}$$

$\mathcal{MC}$ updates ψ_{in} and ψ_{ex} constraints in C with newly discovered branches. For example it may add new labels to an internal choice, or move active labels to inactive in an external choice.

We now give more detail for some inference steps of Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$. The full algorithm can be found in an online technical report[1]. Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ terminates successfully when all sessions on the stack have terminated, the input behaviour is τ and the continuation stack is empty:

$$\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash \tau,\ C,\ \epsilon) = (\sigma,\ C\sigma)$$
$$\text{if}\ \ \sigma = \mathsf{finalize}\ \Delta$$

When this clause succeeds, Δ may be empty or it may contain frames of the form $(l : \psi)$ or $(l : \mathsf{end})$. The helper function $\mathsf{finalise}\ \Delta$ returns a substitution σ that maps all such ψ's to end. If this is not possible (i.e., a session on Δ is not finished) $\mathsf{finalise}$ raises an error.

New frames are pushed on the stack when the behaviour is $\mathsf{push}(l : \eta)$:

$$\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash \mathsf{push}(l : \eta),\ C,\ K) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$$
$$\text{if}\ \ (\sigma_1, \Delta_1) = \mathsf{checkFresh}(l, \Delta)$$
$$\text{and}\ (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}((l : \eta\sigma_1) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \tau,\ C\sigma_1,\ K\sigma_1)$$

where $\mathsf{checkFresh}$ checks that l has never been in Δ.

When the behaviour is an operation that pops a session from the stack, such as a send $(l!T)$, $\mathcal{MC}$ looks up the top frame on the stack, according to the stack principle. There are two cases to consider: either the top frame contains a fresh variable ψ, or some type has been already inferred. The algorithm here is:

[1] Spaccasassi, C., Koutavas, V.: Type-Based Analysis for Session Inference. ArXiv e-prints (Oct 2015), `http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.03929v3`.

$$\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi)\cdot\Delta \vDash \rho!T,\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$$
$$\quad \text{if} \quad C \vdash l \sim \rho$$
$$\quad \text{and } \sigma_1 = [\psi \mapsto !\alpha.\psi'] \text{ where } \alpha, \psi' \text{ fresh}$$
$$\quad \text{and } (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi')\cdot\Delta\sigma_1 \vDash \tau,\ C\sigma_1 \cup \{T \subseteq \alpha\},\ K\sigma_1\big)$$

$$\mathcal{MC}\big((l:!\alpha.\eta)\cdot\Delta \vDash \rho!T,\ C,\ K\big) = \mathcal{MC}\big((l:\eta)\cdot\Delta \vDash \tau,\ C \cup \{T \subseteq \alpha\},\ K\big)$$
$$\quad \text{if} \quad C \vdash l \sim \rho$$

In the first case, $\mathcal{MC}$ checks that ρ in the behaviour corresponds to l at the top of the stack. It then produces the substitution $[\psi \mapsto !\alpha.\psi']$, where α and ψ' are fresh, and adds $(T \subseteq \alpha)$ to C. The second case produces no substitution.

The clauses for delegation are similar:

$$\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi)\cdot(l_d:\eta_d)\cdot\Delta \vDash \rho!\rho_d,\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$$
$$\quad \text{if } \ C \vdash l \sim \rho \text{ and } C \vdash l_d \sim \rho_d$$
$$\quad \text{and } \sigma_1 = [\psi \mapsto !\eta_d.\psi'] \text{ where } \psi' \text{ fresh}$$
$$\quad \text{and } (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi')\cdot\Delta\sigma \vDash \tau,\ C\sigma_1,\ K\sigma_1\big)$$

$$\mathcal{MC}\big((l:!\eta_d.\eta)\cdot(l_d:\eta'_d)\cdot\Delta \vDash \rho!\rho_d,\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$$
$$\quad \text{if} \quad C \vdash l \sim \rho \text{ and } C \vdash l_d \sim \rho_d$$
$$\quad \text{and } (\sigma_1, C_1) = \ \mathsf{sub}(\eta'_d, \eta_d, C)$$
$$\quad \text{and } (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}\big((l:\eta)\cdot\Delta\sigma \vDash \tau,\ C_1,\ K\sigma_1\big)$$

The main difference here is that, in the second clause, the sub function checks that $C \vdash \eta'_d <: \eta_d$ and performs relevant inference. Moreover, the input Δ must contain at least two frames (the frame below the top one is delegated).

The cases for receive, label selection and offer, and resume are similar (see online report). In the cases for label selection and offering, the algorithm updates the ψ_{in} and ψ_{ex} variables, as discussed above. In the case of resume, the algorithm checks that the stack contains one frame.

In behaviour sequencing and branching, substitutions are applied eagerly and composed iteratively, and new constraints are accumulated in C:

$$\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b_1\,;b_2,\ C,\ K\big) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b_1,\ C,\ b_2 \cdot K\big)$$

$$\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b_1 \oplus b_2,\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$$
$$\quad \text{if} \quad (\sigma_1, C_1) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b_1,\ C,\ K\big)$$
$$\quad \text{and } (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta\sigma_1 \vDash b_2\sigma_1,\ C_1,\ K\sigma_1\big)$$

When a recursive behaviour $\mathsf{rec}_b\,\beta$ is encountered, Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ needs to properly setup the input constraints C according to Rule Rec of Fig. 4:

$$\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash \mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b,\ C) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$$
$$\quad \text{if} \quad C = C' \uplus \{b' \subseteq \beta\}$$
$$\quad \text{and } (\sigma_1, C_1) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\epsilon \vDash b,\ C' \cup \{\tau \subseteq \beta\},\ \epsilon\big)$$
$$\quad \text{and } (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta\sigma_1 \vDash \tau,\ (C_1 \backslash \{\tau \subseteq \beta\}) \cup (\{b' \subseteq \beta\})\sigma_1,\ K\sigma_1\big)$$

Here the algorithm first calls $\mathcal{MC}$ on $\epsilon \vDash b$, checking that the recursion body b is self-contained under C', in which the recursion variable β is bound to τ. This update of C prevents the infinite unfolding of $\mathsf{rec}_b\,\beta$. It then restores back the constraint on β, applies the substitution σ_1, and continues inference.

The clause for $\mathsf{spawn}\, b$ is similar, except that C is unchanged. Variables β are treated as the internal choice of all behaviours b_i bound to β in C:

$$\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash \beta,\ C,\ K) = \mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash b,\ C,\ K)$$
$$\text{where}\quad b = \bigoplus\{b_i \mid \exists i.\ (b_i \subseteq \beta) \in C\}$$

Inference fails when $\mathcal{MC}$ reaches a stuck configuration $\Delta \vDash b$ other than $\epsilon \vDash \tau$, corresponding to an error in the session type discipline.

To prove termination of $\mathcal{SI}$, we first define the translation $[\![b]\!]^{\mathsf{g}}_C$, that replaces β variables in b with the internal choice $\bigoplus\{\, b_i \,|\, (\{b_i \subseteq \beta\}) \in C \,\}$. Due to behaviour-compactness (Def. 5.1), $[\![b]\!]^{\mathsf{g}}_C$ is a finite *ground* term, i.e. a finite term without β variables. Except for Rule Beta, transitions in Fig. 4 never expand b; they either consume Δ or b. Since $[\![b]\!]^{\mathsf{g}}_C$ is finite when C is well-formed, $\epsilon \vDash [\![b]\!]^{\mathsf{g}}_C$ generates a finite state space and Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ always terminates.

Similar to ML type inference, the worst-case complexity of $\mathcal{MC}$ is exponential to program size: $\mathcal{MC}$ runs in time linear to the size of $[\![b]\!]^{\mathsf{g}}_C$, which in the worst case is exponentially larger than b, which is linear to program size. The worst case appears in pathological programs where, e.g., each function calls all previously defined functions. We intend to explore whether this is an issue in practice, especially with an optimised dynamic programming implementation of $\mathcal{MC}$.

Soundness and completeness of $\mathcal{SI}$ follow from the these properties of $\mathcal{MC}$.

Lemma 6.1 (Soundness of $\mathcal{MC}$). *Let C be well-formed and $\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash b, C) = (\sigma_1, C_1)$; then $\Delta\sigma_1 = \Delta'$ and $\Delta' \vDash b\sigma_1 \Downarrow_{C_1}$.*

Lemma 6.2 (Completeness of $\mathcal{MC}$). *Let C be well-formed and $(\Delta \vDash b)\sigma \Downarrow_C$; then $\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash b, C_0) = (\sigma_1, C_1)$ and $\exists\sigma'$ such that $C \vdash C_1\sigma'$ and $\forall\psi \in dom(\sigma)$, $C \vdash \sigma(\psi) <: \sigma'(\sigma_1(\psi))$.*

Completeness states that $\mathcal{MC}$ computes the most general constraints C_1 and substitution σ_1, because, for any C and σ such that $(\Delta \vDash b)\sigma$ type checks, C specialises C_1 and σ is an instance of σ_1, after some extra substitution σ' of variables (immaterial for type checking).

Algorithm $\mathcal{D}$ collects all $c \sim \eta_1$ and $\bar{c} \sim \eta_2$ constraints in C', generates duality constraints $\eta_1 \bowtie \eta_2$ and iteratively checks them, possibly substituting ψ variables. It ultimately returns a C'' which is a valid type solution according to Def. 5.3. Soundness and completeness of Algorithm $\mathcal{D}$ is straightforward.

We now show how $\mathcal{SI}$ infers the correct session types for Ex. 2.1 from Sect. 2. We assume that Algorithm $\mathcal{W}$ has already produced a behaviour b and constraints C for this example. For clarity, we simplify b and C: we remove spurious τs from behaviour sequences, replace region variables ρ with labels (only one label flows to each ρ), and perform simple substitutions of β variables.

Example 6.1 (A Swap Service).

There are three textual sources of endpoints in this example: the two occurrences of acc-swp in coord, and req-swp in swap. A pre-processing step automatically annotates them with three unique labels l_1, l_2 and l_3. Algorithm $\mathcal{W}$ infers b and C for Ex. 2.1; the behaviour b (simplified) is:

$$\mathsf{spawn}\,(\beta_{coord});\, \mathsf{spawn}\,(\beta_{swap});\, \mathsf{spawn}\,(\beta_{swap})$$

In this behaviour three processes are spawned: one with a β_{coord} behaviour, and two with a β_{swap} behaviour. The behaviour associated to each of these variables is described in C, along with other constraints:

1. $\mathsf{rec}_{\beta_{coord}}\,(\mathsf{push}(l_1 : \psi_1); l_1?\alpha_1; \mathsf{push}(l_2 : \psi_1); l_2?\alpha_2; l_2!\alpha_1; l_1!\alpha_2); \beta_{coord} \subseteq \beta_{coord}$
2. $\mathsf{push}(l_3 : \psi_2); l_3!\mathsf{Int}; l_3?\alpha_3 \subseteq \beta_{swap}$
3. $\overline{swap} \sim \psi_1$
4. $swap \sim \psi_2$

The above behaviour and environment are the inputs to Algorithm $\mathcal{SI}$, implementing session type inference according to the second level of our framework. The invocation $\mathcal{SI}(b, C)$ calls $\mathcal{MC}\big(\epsilon \vDash b,\ C,\ \epsilon\big)$, where the first ϵ is the empty endpoint stack Δ and the second ϵ is the empty continuation stack. Behaviour b is decomposed as $b = K[b']$, where $b' = \mathsf{spawn}\,(\beta_{coord})$ and K is the continuation $[\ ]; \mathsf{spawn}\,(\beta_{swap}); \mathsf{spawn}\,(\beta_{swap})$. The algorithm thus calls $\mathcal{MC}\big(\epsilon \vDash \mathsf{spawn}\,(\beta_{coord}),\ C,\ K\big)$, which, after replacing β_{coord} and unfolding its inner recursive behaviour becomes:

$$\mathcal{MC}\big(\epsilon \vDash \mathsf{push}(l_1 : \psi_1); l_1?\alpha_1; \mathsf{push}(l_2 : \psi_1); l_2?\alpha_2; l_2!\alpha_1; l_1!\alpha_2; \beta_{coord},\ C_1,\ \epsilon\big)$$

Here C_1 is equal to C above, with the exception of replacing Constraint 1 with the constraint $(\tau \subseteq \beta_{coord})$. Inference is now straightforward: the frame $(l_1 : \psi_1)$ is first pushed on the endpoint stack. From behaviour $l_1?\alpha_1$ the algorithm applies substitution $[\psi_1 \mapsto ?\alpha_4.\psi_4]$, where ψ_4 and α_4 are fresh, and generates constraint $(\alpha_4 \subseteq \alpha_1)$ obtaining C_2. We thus get:

$$\mathcal{MC}\big((l_1 : \psi_4) \vDash \mathsf{push}(l_2 : ?\alpha_4.\psi_4); l_2?\alpha_2; l_2!\alpha_1; l_1!\alpha_2; \beta_{coord},\ C_2,\ \epsilon\big)$$

After the next push, the endpoint stack becomes $(l_2 : ?\alpha_4.\psi_4) \cdot (l_1 : \psi_4)$. The next behaviour $l_2?\alpha_2$ causes $\mathcal{MC}$ to create constraint $(\alpha_4 \subseteq \alpha_2)$ obtaining C_3, and to consume session $?\alpha_4$ from the top frame of the endpoint stack.

$$\mathcal{MC}\big((l_2 : \psi_4) \cdot (l_1 : \psi_4) \vDash l_2!\alpha_1; l_1!\alpha_2; \beta_{coord},\ C_3,\ \epsilon\big)$$

Because of $l_2!\alpha_1$, $\mathcal{MC}$ generates $[\psi_3 \mapsto\ !\alpha_5.\psi_5]$ and $(\alpha_1 \subseteq \alpha_5)$ obtaining C_4.

$$\mathcal{MC}\big((l_2 : \psi_5) \cdot (l_1 : !\alpha_5.\psi_5) \vDash l_1!\alpha_2; \beta_{coord},\ C_4,\ \epsilon\big)$$

Since l_1 in the behaviour and l_2 at the top of the endpoint stack do not match, $\mathcal{MC}$ infers that ψ_5 must be the terminated session end. Therefore it substitutes $[\psi_5 \mapsto \mathsf{end}]$ obtaining C_5. Because of the substitutions, C_5 contains $\overline{swap} \sim ?\alpha_4.!\alpha_5.\mathsf{end}$. After analysing β_{swap}, $\mathcal{MC}$ produces C_6 where $swap \sim !\mathsf{Int}.!\alpha_6.\mathsf{end}$.

During the above execution $\mathcal{MC}$ verifies that the stack principle is respected and no endpoint label is pushed on the stack twice. Finally the algorithm calls $\mathcal{D}(C_6)$ which performs a duality check between the constraints of $\overline{swap}$ and $swap$, inferring substitution $[\alpha_4 \mapsto \mathsf{Int},\ \alpha_6 \mapsto \alpha_5]$. The accumulated constraints on type variables α give the resulting session types of the swap channel endpoints: $(\overline{swap} \sim ?\mathsf{Int}.!\mathsf{Int}.\mathsf{end})$ and $(swap \sim !\mathsf{Int}.?\mathsf{Int}.\mathsf{end})$.

7 A Proposal for Recursive Session Types

The system we have presented does not include recursive session types. Here we propose an extension to the type system with recursive types. The inference algorithm for this extension is non-trivial and we leave it to future work.

In this extension, a recursive behaviour may partially use a recursive session type and rely on the continuation behaviour to fully consume it. First we add *guarded* recursive session types: $\eta ::= \ldots \mid \mu X.\eta \mid X$. The first level of our type system remains unchanged, as it is parametric to session types, and already contains recursive functions and behaviours.

A recursive behaviour $\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b$ operating on an endpoint l with session type $\mu X.\eta$ may: (a) run in an infinite loop, always unfolding the session type; (b) terminate leaving l at type end; (c) terminate leaving l at type $\mu X.\eta$. Behaviour b may have multiple execution paths, some terminating, ending at τ, and some recursive, ending at a recursive call β. They all need to leave l at the same type, either end or $\mu X.\eta$; the terminating paths of b determine which of the two session types l will have after $\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b$. If b contains no terminating paths then we assume that l is fully consumed by $\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b$ and type the continuation with l at end.

To achieve this, we add a *stack environment* D in the rules of Fig. 4, which maps labels l to stacks Δ. If $\Delta_1 = (l : \mu X.\eta)$, we call an *$l$-path* from $\Delta_1 \vDash b_1$ any finite sequence of transitions such that $\Delta_1 \vDash b_1 \to_{C,D} \ldots \to_{C,D} \Delta_n \vDash b_n \not\to_{C,D}$. A l-path is called *l-finitary* if there is no $b_i = \tau^l$ for any configuration i in the series; otherwise we say that the path is *l-recursive*. We write $(l : \mu X.\eta) \vDash b \Downarrow^{\mathsf{fin}}_{C,D} \Delta'$ when the last configuration of all l-finitary paths from $(l : \mu X.\eta) \vDash b$ is $\Delta' \vDash \tau$. Similarly, we write $(l : \mu X.\eta) \vDash b \Downarrow^{\mathsf{rec}}_{C,D} \Delta'$ when the last configuration of all l-recursive paths from $(l : \mu X.\eta) \vDash b$ is $\Delta' \vDash \tau^l$. When no $l-$ paths from $(l : \mu X.\eta) \vDash b$ is l-finitary, we stipulate $(l : \mu X.\eta) \vDash b \Downarrow^{\mathsf{fin}}_{C,D} (l : \mathsf{end})$ holds. We add the following rules to those of Fig. 4.

Rec2

$$\frac{(l : \mu X.\eta) \vDash b \Downarrow^{\mathsf{fin}}_{C',D'} \Delta' \qquad (l : \mu X.\eta) \vDash b \Downarrow^{\mathsf{rec}}_{C',D'} \Delta'}{(l : \mu X.\eta) \cdot \Delta \vDash \mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b \to_{C,D} \Delta' \cdot \Delta \vDash b'}$$

$\Delta' \in \{(l : \mathsf{end}), (l : \mu X.\eta)\}$
$C' = (C \backslash (\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b \subseteq \beta)) \cup (\tau^l \subseteq \beta)$
$D' = D[l \mapsto \Delta']$

RCall

$$\frac{}{(l : \mu X.\eta) \vDash \tau^l \to_{C,D} D(l) \vDash \tau}$$

Unf

$$\frac{(l : \eta[X \mapsto \mu X.\eta]) \cdot \Delta \vDash b \to_{C,D} \Delta' \vDash b'}{(l : \mu X.\eta) \cdot \Delta \vDash b \to_{C,D} \Delta' \vDash b'}$$

Rule Rec2 requires that both l-finitary and l-recursive paths converge to the same stack Δ', either $(l : \mathsf{end})$ or $(l : \mu X.\eta)$. In this rule, similarly to rule Rec in Fig. 4, we replace the recursive constraint $(\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b \subseteq \beta)$ with $(\tau^l \subseteq \beta)$, representing a trivial recursive call of β. This guarantees that all l-paths have a finite number of states. The D environment is extended with $l \mapsto \Delta'$, used in Rule RCall to obtain the session type of l after a recursive call. Rule Unf simply unfolds a recursive session type.

8 Related Work and Conclusions

We presented a new approach for adding binary session types to high-level programming languages, and applied it to a core of ML with session communication. In the extended language our system checks the session protocols of interesting programs, including one where pure code calls library code with communication effects, without having to refactor the pure code (Ex. 2.3). Type soundness guarantees partial lock freedom, session fidelity and communication safety.

Our approach is modular, organised in two levels, the first focusing on the type system of the source language and second on typing sessions; the two levels communicate through *effects*. In the fist level we adapted and extended the work of Amtoft, Nielson and Nielson [1] to session communication, and used it to extract the communication effect of programs. In the second level we developed a session typing discipline inspired by Castagna et al. [3]. This modular approach achieves a provably complete session inference for finite sessions without programmer annotations.

Another approach to checking session types in high-level languages is to use substructural type systems. For example, Vasconcelos et al. [18] develop such a system for a functional language with threads, and Wadler [19] presents a linear functional language with effects. Type soundness in the former guarantees session fidelity and communication safety, and in the latter also lock freedom and strong normalisation. Our system is in between these two extremes: lock freedom is guaranteed only when processes do not diverge and their requests for new sessions are met. Other systems give similar guarantees (e.g., [3, 16]).

Toninho et al. [16] add session-typed communication to a functional language using a monad. Monads, similar to effects, cleanly separate session communication from the rest of the language features which, unlike effects, require parts of the program to be written in a monadic style. Pucella and Tov [13] use an indexed monad to embed session types in Haskell, however with limited endpoint delegation: delegation relies on moving capabilities, which cannot escape their static scope. Our Ex. 2.2 is not typable in that system because of this. In [13] session types are inferred by Haskell's type inference. However, the programmer must guide inference with expressions solely used to manipulate type structures.

Tov [17] has shown that session types can be encoded in a language with a general-purpose substructural type system. Type inference alleviates the need for typing annotations in the examples considered. Completeness of session inference relies on completeness of inference in the general language, which is not clear.

Igarashi et al. [9] propose a reconstruction algorithm for finite types in the linear π calculus. Inference is complete and requires no annotations. Padovani [11] extends this work to pairs, disjoint sums and regular recursive types.

Mezzina [10] gives an inference algorithm for session types in a calculus of services. The type system does not support recursive session types and endpoint delegation. It does allow, however to type replicated processes that only use finite session types, similar to our approach.

Bibliography

[1] Amtoft, T., Nielson, H.R., Nielson, F.: Type and effect systems - behaviours for concurrency. Imperial College Press (1999)

[2] Caires, L., Pfenning, F.: Session types as intuitionistic linear propositions. In: Gastin, P., Laroussinie, F. (eds.) CONCUR, LNCS, vol. 6269, pp. 222–236. Springer (2010)

[3] Castagna, G., Dezani-Ciancaglini, M., Giachino, E., Padovani, L.: Foundations of session types. In: PPDP. pp. 219–230. ACM (2009)

[4] Gay, S., Hole, M.: Subtyping for session types in the pi calculus. Acta Informatica 42(2-3), 191–225 (2005)

[5] Gay, S., Vasconcelos, V.: Linear type theory for asynchronous session types. Journal of Functional Programming 20(01), 19–50 (Jan 2010)

[6] Honda, K.: Types for dyadic interaction. In: Best, E. (ed.) CONCUR, LNCS, vol. 715, pp. 509–523. Springer (1993)

[7] Honda, K., Vasconcelos, V.T., Kubo, M.: Language primitives and type discipline for structured communication-based programming. In: Hankin, C. (ed.) PLS (ESOP), LNCS, vol. 1381, pp. 122–138. Springer (1998)

[8] Hüttel, H., Lanese, I., Vasconcelos, V., Caires, L., Carbone, M., Deniélou, P., Padovani, L., Ravara, A., Tuosto, E., Vieira, H., Zavattaro, G.: Foundations of session types and behavioural contracts. ACM Comp. Surv. To appear

[9] Igarashi, A., Kobayashi, N.: Type reconstruction for linear π-calculus with I/O subtyping. Inf. Comput. 161(1), 1–44 (2000)

[10] Mezzina, L.G.: How to infer finite session types in a calculus of services and sessions. In: Lea, D., Zavattaro, G. (eds.) Coordination Models and Languages, LNCS, vol. 5052, pp. 216–231. Springer (2008)

[11] Padovani, L.: Type reconstruction for the linear π-calculus with composite regular types. Logical Methods in Computer Science 11(4) (2015)

[12] Palsberg, J.: Type-based analysis and applications. In: PASTE. pp. 20–27. ACM (2001)

[13] Pucella, R., Tov, J.A.: Haskell session types with (almost) no class. In: Haskell Symposium. pp. 25–36. ACM (2008)

[14] Shivers, O.: Control-flow analysis of higher-order languages. Ph.D. thesis, CMU (1991)

[15] Tofte, M., Talpin, J.: Implementation of the typed call-by-value lambda-calculus using a stack of regions. In: POPL. pp. 188–201. ACM (1994)

[16] Toninho, B., Caires, L., Pfenning, F.: Higher-order processes, functions, and sessions: A monadic integration. In: Felleisen, M., Gardner, P. (eds.) PLS (ESOP), LNCS, vol. 7792, pp. 350–369. Springer (2013)

[17] Tov, J.: Practical Programming with Substructural Types. Ph.D. thesis, Northeastern University (2012)

[18] Vasconcelos, V., Gay, S., Ravara, A.: Type checking a multithreaded functional language with session types. Th. Computer Sc. 368(1-2), 64–87 (2006)

[19] Wadler, P.: Propositions as sessions. In: ICFP. pp. 273–286. ACM (2012)

Appendix

A Omitted definitions and examples

The following section presents the complete definitions of concepts and examples that could not be spelled out in full details because of space constraints.

A.1 Full type system and definitions for the first level

TPair
$$\frac{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e_1 : T_1 \triangleright b_1 \quad C;\ \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T_2 \triangleright b_2}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash (e_1, e_2) : T_1 \times T_2 \triangleright b_1 ; b_2}$$

TVar
$$\frac{}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash x : \Gamma(x) \triangleright \tau}$$

TIf
$$\frac{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \mathsf{Bool} \triangleright b_1 \quad C;\ \Gamma \vdash e_i : T \triangleright b_i \ \ (i \in \{1,2\})}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{if}\, e_1\, \mathsf{then}\, e_2\, \mathsf{else}\, e_3 : T \triangleright b_1 ; (b_2 \oplus b_3)}$$

TConst
$$\frac{}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash k : \mathit{typeof}(k) \triangleright \tau}$$

TApp
$$\frac{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e_1 : T' \xrightarrow{\beta} T \triangleright b_1 \quad C;\ \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T' \triangleright b_2}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e_1\, e_2 : T \triangleright b_1 ; b_2 ; \beta}$$

TFun
$$\frac{C;\ \Gamma, x : T \vdash e : T' \triangleright \beta}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{fn}\, x \Rightarrow e : T \xrightarrow{\beta} T' \triangleright \tau}$$

TMatch
$$\frac{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : \mathsf{Ses}^{\rho} \triangleright b \quad C;\ \Gamma \vdash e_i : T \triangleright b_i \ \ (i \in I)}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{case}\, e\, \{L_i : e_i\}_{i \in I} : T \triangleright b ; \underset{i \in I}{\&} \{\rho ? L_i ; b_i\}}$$

TEndp
$$\frac{}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash p^{l} : \mathsf{Ses}^{\rho} \triangleright \tau} \quad C \vdash \rho \sim l$$

TLet
$$\frac{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e_1 : TS \triangleright b_1 \quad C;\ \Gamma, x : TS \vdash e_2 : T \triangleright b_2}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{let}\, x = e_1\, \mathsf{in}\, e_2 : T \triangleright b_1 ; b_2}$$

TSub
$$\frac{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : T \triangleright b}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : T' \triangleright \beta} \quad \begin{array}{l} C \vdash T <: T' \\ C \vdash b \subseteq \beta \end{array}$$

TSpawn
$$\frac{C;\ \mathit{confd}_C(\Gamma) \vdash e : \mathsf{Unit} \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathsf{Unit} \triangleright b}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{spawn}\, e : \mathsf{Unit} \triangleright b ; \mathsf{spawn}\, \beta}$$

TRec
$$\frac{C;\ \mathit{confd}_C(\Gamma), f : T \xrightarrow{\beta} T', x : T \vdash e : T' \triangleright b}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{fun}\, f(x) = e : T \xrightarrow{\beta} T' \triangleright \tau} \quad \begin{array}{l} C \vdash \mathit{confd}(T, T') \\ C \vdash \mathsf{rec}_{\beta}\, b \subseteq \beta \end{array}$$

TIns
$$\frac{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : \forall(\vec{\gamma} : C_0).T \triangleright b}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : T\sigma \triangleright b} \quad \begin{array}{l} \mathit{dom}(\sigma) \subseteq \{\vec{\gamma}\} \\ \forall(\vec{\gamma} : C_0).\, T \text{ is solvable from } C \text{ by } \sigma \end{array}$$

TGen
$$\frac{C \cup C_0;\ \Gamma \vdash e : T \triangleright b}{C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : \forall(\vec{\gamma} : C_0).T \triangleright b} \quad \begin{array}{l} \{\vec{\gamma}\} \cap \mathrm{fv}(\Gamma, C, b) = \emptyset \\ \forall(\vec{\gamma} : C_0).T \text{ is WF, solvable from } C \end{array}$$

Definition A.1 (Functional Subtyping). *$C \vdash T <: T'$ is the least reflexive, transitive, compatible relation on types with the axioms:*

$$\frac{(T_1 \subseteq T_2) \in C}{C \vdash T_1 <: T_2} \qquad \frac{C \vdash \rho \sim \rho'}{C \vdash \mathsf{Ses}^{\rho} <: \mathsf{Ses}^{\rho'}} \qquad \frac{C \vdash T_1' <: T_1 \quad C \vdash \beta \subseteq \beta' \quad C \vdash T_2 <: T_2'}{C \vdash T_1 \xrightarrow{\beta} T_2 <: T_1' \xrightarrow{\beta'} T_2'}$$

A.2 Confined types and behaviours

Definition A.2 (Confined Behaviors). *$C \vdash confd(b)$ is the least compatible relation on behaviours that admits the following axioms:*

$$\textsc{CTau}\ \frac{b \in \{\tau,\ \mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b'\}}{C \vdash confd(b)} \qquad \textsc{CAx-B}\ \frac{cfd(b) \in C}{C \vdash confd(b)}$$

$$\textsc{CICh}\ \frac{C \vdash confd(b_1) \quad C \vdash confd(b_2)}{C \vdash confd(b_1 \oplus b_2)} \qquad \textsc{CICh-Bw}\ \frac{C \vdash confd(b_1 \oplus b_2)}{C \vdash confd(b_i)}\ i \in \{1,2\}$$

$$\textsc{CSeq}\ \frac{C \vdash confd(b_1) \quad C \vdash confd(b_2)}{C \vdash confd(b_1; b_2)} \qquad \textsc{CSeq-Bw}\ \frac{C \vdash confd(b_1; b_2)}{C \vdash confd(b_i)}\ i \in \{1,2\}$$

$$\textsc{CSpw}\ \frac{C \vdash confd(b)}{C \vdash confd(\mathsf{spawn}\, b)} \qquad \textsc{CSpw-Bw}\ \frac{C \vdash confd(\mathsf{spawn}\, b)}{C \vdash confd(b)}$$

$$\textsc{CSub-B}\ \frac{C \vdash b_1 \subseteq b_2 \quad C \vdash confd(b_2)}{C \vdash confd(b_1)}$$

Definition A.3 (Confined Types). *$C \vdash confd(o)$ is the least compatible relation on type schemas and types that admits the following axioms.*

$$\textsc{CCons}\ \frac{T \in \{\mathsf{Int}, \mathsf{Bool}, \mathsf{Unit}\}}{C \vdash confd(T)} \qquad \textsc{CAx-T}\ \frac{cfd(T) \in C}{C \vdash confd(T)}$$

$$\textsc{CSub-T}\ \frac{C \vdash T_1 \subseteq T_2 \quad C \vdash confd(T_2)}{C \vdash confd(T_1)} \qquad \textsc{CSub-T-Bw}\ \frac{\forall T_1.(C \vdash T_1 \subseteq T_2) \Longrightarrow C \vdash confd(T_1)}{C \vdash confd(T_2)}$$

$$\textsc{CFun}\ \frac{C \vdash confd(T, T') \quad C \vdash confd(\beta)}{C \vdash confd(T \xrightarrow{\beta} T')} \qquad \textsc{CFun-Bw}\ \frac{C \vdash confd(T \xrightarrow{\beta} T') \quad o \in \{T, T', \beta\}}{C \vdash confd(o)}$$

$$\textsc{CTup}\ \frac{C \vdash confd(T, T')}{C \vdash confd(T \times T')} \qquad \textsc{CTup-Bw}\ \frac{C \vdash confd(T \times T') \quad o \in \{T, T'\}}{C \vdash confd(o)}$$

$$\textsc{CTS}\ \frac{C, C_0 \vdash confd(T)}{C \vdash confd(\forall(\vec{\gamma} : C_0).T)}$$

We define $confd_C(\Gamma)$ as the largest subset of Γ such that for all bindings $(x : TS) \in confd_C(\Gamma)$ we have $C \vdash confd(TS)$.

The above definitions admit behaviours constructed by τ and recursive behaviours (CTau), and types that are constructed by such behaviours and the base types $\mathsf{Int}, \mathsf{Bool}, \mathsf{Unit}$ (CCons). The definitions allow for type and behaviour variables (α, β) as long as they are only related to confined types in C (CAx-b, CAx-T). Sub-behaviours of confined behaviours and sub-types of confined types are confined too (CSub-b, CSub-T). Type schemas are confined if all their instantiations in C are confined (CTS). The definitions contain composition rules for composite behaviours and types (CICh, CSeq, CSpw, CFun, CTup); they also contain decomposition (or "*backward*") rules for the same composite constructs (CICh-Bw, CSeq-Bw, CSpw-Bw, CFun-Bw, CTup-Bw). The backward rules ensure that all the sub-components of a confined behaviour or type in C are also confined.

A.3 Active and inactive labels

Consider a program $P[e_1][e_2]$ containing the expressions:

$$e_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathsf{let}\, x = \mathsf{acc}\text{-}c^{l_1}\,()\ \mathsf{in}\ \mathsf{case}\, x\, \{L_1 \Rightarrow e,\ L_2 \Rightarrow e^\star\}$$
$$e_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathsf{let}\, x = \mathsf{req}\text{-}c^{l_2}\,()\ \mathsf{in}\ \mathsf{sel}\text{-}L_2\, x$$

Suppose $e^\star$ contains a type error, possibly because of a mismatch in session types with another part of P. If a type inference algorithm run on $P[e_1][e_2]$ first examines e_1, it will explore both branches of the choice, tentatively constructing the session type $\Sigma\{L_1.\eta_1,\ L_2.\eta_2\}$, finding the error in $e^\star$. One strategy might then be to backtrack from typing $e^\star$ (and discard any information learned in the L_2 branch of this and possibly other choices in the code) and continue with the session type $\Sigma\{L_1.\eta_1\}$. However, once e_2 is encountered, the previous error in $e^\star$ should be reported. A programmer, after successfully type checking $P[e_1][()]$, will be surprised to discover a type error in e_1 after adding in e_2. The type-and-effect system here avoids such situations by typing all choice branches, even if they are *inactive*, at the expense of rejecting some—rather contrived—programs. A similar approach is followed in the type-and-effect system of the previous section by requiring *all* branches to have the same type (Rule TMatch in Fig. 3).

A.4 Duality

The program:

$$\mathsf{spawn}\,(\mathsf{fn}\ _ \Rightarrow \mathsf{let}\, x = \mathsf{req}\text{-}c\,()\ \mathsf{in}\ \mathsf{send}\, x\, \mathsf{tt});\ \ \mathsf{let}\, x = \mathsf{acc}\text{-}c\,()\ \mathsf{in}\ \mathsf{recv}\, x + 1$$

should not be typable because its processes use dual endpoints at incompatible session types. Therefore session types on dual session endpoints ($c \sim \eta$, $\overline{c} \sim \eta'$) must be dual, where duality is defined as follows:

Definition A.4 (Duality). *$C \vdash \eta \bowtie \eta'$ if the following rules and their symmetric ones are satisfied.*

$$\frac{}{C \vdash \mathsf{end} \bowtie \mathsf{end}} \qquad \frac{C \vdash T <: T' \quad C \vdash \eta \bowtie \eta'}{C \vdash\, !T.\eta \bowtie\, ?T'.\eta'} \qquad \frac{C \vdash \eta_0 <: \eta_0' \quad C \vdash \eta \bowtie \eta'}{C \vdash\, !\eta_0.\eta \bowtie\, ?\eta_0'.\eta'}$$

$$\frac{\forall i \in I_0.\ \ C \vdash \eta_i \bowtie \eta_i'}{C \vdash \bigoplus_{i \in I_0} \{L_i : \eta_i\} \bowtie \&\{L_i : \eta_i'\})_{i \in (I_0 I_1, I_2)}}$$

where $C \vdash \eta <: \eta'$ *is Gay&Hole [4] subtyping, with* C *needed for inner uses of* $C \vdash T <: T'$*, extended to our form of external choice, where* $C \vdash \&\{L_i : \eta_i'\}_{i \in (I_1, I_2)} <: \&\{L_i : \eta_i'\}_{i \in (J_1, J_2)}$ *when* $I_1 \subseteq J_1$ *and* $J_1 \cup J_2 \subseteq I_1 \cup I_2$ *and* $\forall (i \in J_1 \cup J_2).\ C \vdash \eta_i <: \eta_i'$*.*

A.5 Dependencies

Thanks to the definition of well-stackedness, we can give a more precise account of type soundness. We can define dependencies between processes of a running system according to the following definition.

Definition A.5 (Dependencies). *Let* $P = \big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big)$ *and* $Q = \big(\Delta' \vDash b',\ e'\big)$ *be processes in* $\mathcal{S}$*.*

P **and** Q **are *ready* ($P \leftrightharpoons Q$):** *if* $\Delta = (p^l : \eta) \cdot \Delta_0$ *and* $\Delta' = (\overline{p}^{l'} : \eta') \cdot \Delta_0'$*;*
P **is *waiting* on** Q **($P \mapsto Q$):** *if* $\Delta = (p^l : \eta) \cdot \Delta_0$ *and* $\Delta' = \Delta_1' \cdot (\overline{p}^{l'} : \eta') \cdot \Delta_0'$ *and* $\Delta_1' \neq \epsilon$*;*
P ***depends* on** Q, R **($P \Mapsto (Q, R)$):** *if* $P = Q \leftrightharpoons R$*, or* $P \mapsto^+ Q \leftrightharpoons R$*.*

The type soundness theorem (Cor. A.1) can be reformulated to show that blocked processes depend on a process that is either waiting, diverging or blocked:

Corollary A.1 (Type Soundness with dependencies). *Let* $C \Vdash \mathcal{S}$ *and* $C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{S}$*. Then*

1. $\mathcal{S} \Longrightarrow_{\mathsf{c}} \mathcal{S}'$*, or*
2. $\mathcal{S} \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{i}}^* (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{B})$ *such that:*
   Processes in $\mathcal{F}$ are finished: $\forall \big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big) \in \mathcal{F}.\ \Delta = \epsilon, b = \tau$ *and* $e = v$*.*
   Processes in $\mathcal{D}$ diverge: $\forall \big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big) \in \mathcal{D}.\ \big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big) \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{i}}^{\infty}$*.*
   Processes in $\mathcal{W}$ wait on channels: $\forall \big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big) \in \mathcal{W}.\ e = E[\mathsf{req}\text{-}c^l]$ *or* $e = E[\mathsf{acc}\text{-}c^l]$*.*
   Processes in $\mathcal{B}$ block on sessions: $\forall P = \big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big) \in \mathcal{B}.\ e = E[e_0]$ *and* e_0 *is* $\mathsf{send}\, v$*,* $\mathsf{recv}\, v$*,* $\mathsf{deleg}\ v$*,* $\mathsf{resume}\, v$*,* $\mathsf{sel}\text{-}L\, v$*, or* $\mathsf{case}\, v\, \{L_i \Rightarrow e_i\}_{i \in I}$ *and* $\exists Q \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{W}).\ \exists R \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{B}).\ \mathcal{S} \vdash P \Mapsto (Q, R)$*.*

A.6 Subtyping in recursive session types

We add a brief discussion about subtyping for the recursive session types in Sect. 7. We only consider recursive session types that are guarded, and therefore contractive; thus the subtyping relation for the extended session types only needs to perform a standard unfolding of recursive types [4]. Note that the definition of functional subtyping (Def. A.1) is unaffected because it involves behaviours but not session types.

Subtyping is used in the definition of duality (Def. A.4), which remains unaffected. Our inference algorithm relies on a decision procedure for duality ($\mathcal{D}$) which now needs to use a decision procedure for subtyping of equi-recursive types, such as the algorithm of Kozen, Parsberg and Schwartzbach[2]. This is the main modification of our inference algorithm when adding recursive session types.

[2] Kozen, D., Palsberg, J., Schwartzbach, M.I.: Efficient recursive subtyping. Mathematical Structures in Computer Science 5(1), 113–125 (1995)

B Type Soundness

To prove type soundness (progress and preservation) we first define the typed reductions of $\mathcal{S}$ configurations shown in Fig. 6. Recall that we let $\mathcal{S}$ range over $\overrightarrow{(\Delta \vDash b,\ e)}$, write S for $\overrightarrow{e}$ when $\mathcal{S} = \overrightarrow{(\Delta \vDash b,\ e)}$, and identify $\mathcal{S}$ and S up to reordering. Here we write $\vec{b}$ for an arbitrary sequential composition of behaviours, which may be empty (ϵ). We also superscripts in sequences of terms to identify them (e.g., $\vec{\tau}^1$ may be different than $\vec{\tau}^2$), and we identify sequential compositions up to associativity and the axiom $\epsilon\,;b = b\,;\epsilon = b$.

In Sect. 4 we assumed that programs are annotated by unique region labels in a pre-processing step. This is necessary to achieve the maximum accuracy of our system (and reject fewer programs). Because beta reductions can duplicate annotations here we drop the well-annotated property. Type soundness for general annotated programs implies type soundness for uniquely annotated programs.

Lemma B.1 (Weakening). *Suppose* $C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : TS \triangleright b$. *Then* $C;\ \Gamma \uplus \Gamma' \vdash e : TS \triangleright b$.

Proof. By induction on $C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : TS \triangleright b$.

Lemma B.2 (Type Decomposition). *Suppose* $C;\ \Gamma \vdash E[e] : TS \triangleright b$. *Then there exist* TS', b', $\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}}$ *and fresh* x *such that* $b = \vec{\tau}\,; b'\,; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}}$ *and* $C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : TS' \triangleright b'$ *and* $C;\ \Gamma, x{:}TS' \vdash E[x] : TS \triangleright \vec{\tau}\,; \tau\,; b_{\mathsf{nxt}}$.

Proof. By structural induction on E.

Lemma B.3 (Type Composition). *Suppose* $C;\ \Gamma, x{:}TS' \vdash E[x] : TS \triangleright b$ *and* $C;\ \Gamma \vdash e : TS' \triangleright b'$. *Then there exists* $\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}}$ *such that* $b = \vec{\tau}\,; \tau\,; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}}$ *and* $C;\ \Gamma \vdash E[e] : TS \triangleright \vec{\tau}\,; b'\,; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}}$.

Proof. By structural induction on E using Lem. B.1.

Lemma B.4. *Suppose* $C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{S}, \big(\Delta \cdot (p^l : \eta) \cdot \Delta' \vDash b,\ e\big)$ *and* $C \vdash \eta <: \eta'$. *Then* $C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{S}, \big(\Delta \cdot (p^l : \eta') \cdot \Delta' \vDash b,\ e\big)$.

B.1 Preservation

Preservation relies on two lemmas, the first is that typed reductions of Fig. 6 preserve well-typedness, well-stackedness and well-annotatedness; the other is that untyped reductions can be simulated by the typed reductions.

Lemma B.5. *Suppose* $C \Vdash \mathcal{S}$ *and* $C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{S}$ *and* $\mathcal{S} \to^C \mathcal{S}'$. *Then* $C \Vdash \mathcal{S}'$ *and* $C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{S}'$.

Proof. By induction on $\mathcal{S} \to^C \mathcal{S}'$ using the type composition and decomposition (Lem.(s) B.3 and B.2).

The most interesting case is that of delegation (TRDEL). In this case we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S} = {} & \big((p^{l_1} : !\eta_d.\eta_1) \cdot (p'^{l'_1} : \eta'_d) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \vec{\tau}^1 ; \tau ; \tau ; \tau ; \rho_1!\rho_d ; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt1}},\ E_1[\mathsf{deleg}\ (p^{l_1}, p'^{l'_1})]\big),\\ & \big((\overline{p}^{l_2} : ?\eta_r.\eta_2) \vDash \vec{\tau}^2 ; \tau ; \tau ; \rho_2?\rho_r ; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt2}},\ E_2[\mathsf{resume}^{l_r}\,\overline{p}^{l_2}]\big),\ \mathcal{S}_0\\ & \to^C \big((p^{l_1} : \eta_1) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \vec{\tau}^1 ; \tau ; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt1}},\ E_1[()]\big),\ \big((\overline{p}^{l_2} : \eta_2) \cdot (p'^{l_r} : \eta_r) \vDash \vec{\tau}^2 ; \tau ; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt2}},\ E_2[p'^{l_r}]\big),\ \mathcal{S}_0 = \mathcal{S}'\end{aligned}$$

and by $C \Vdash \mathcal{S}$:

$$\begin{gathered}C;\ \emptyset \vdash E_1[\mathsf{deleg}\ (p^{l_1}, p'^{l'_1})] : T_1 \triangleright \vec{\tau}^1 ; \tau ; \tau ; \tau ; \rho_1!\rho_d ; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt1}}\\ C;\ \emptyset \vdash E_2[\mathsf{resume}^{l_r}\,\overline{p}^{l_2}] : T_2 \triangleright \vec{\tau}^2 ; \tau ; \tau ; \rho_2?\rho_r ; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt2}}\\ (p^{l_1} : !\eta_d.\eta_1) \cdot (p'^{l'_1} : \eta'_d) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \vec{\tau}^1 ; \tau ; \tau ; \tau ; \rho_1!\rho_d ; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt1}} \Downarrow_C\\ (\overline{p}^{l_2} : ?\eta_r.\eta_2) \vDash \vec{\tau}^2 ; \tau ; \tau ; \rho_2?\rho_r ; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt2}} \Downarrow_C\end{gathered}$$

By type decomposition Lem. B.2 and inversion on the rules of Fig(s). 3 and 4:

$$\begin{array}{ll}C;\ \emptyset \vdash \mathsf{deleg}\ (p^{l_1}, p'^{l'_1}) : \mathsf{Unit} \triangleright \tau ; \tau ; \tau ; \rho_1!\rho_d & C;\ x{:}\mathsf{Unit} \vdash E_1[x] : T_1 \triangleright \vec{\tau}^1 ; \tau ; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt1}}\\ C;\ \emptyset \vdash \mathsf{resume}\,\overline{p}^{l_2} : \mathsf{Ses}^{\rho_r} \triangleright \tau ; \tau ; \rho_2?\rho_r & C;\ x{:}\mathsf{Ses}^{\rho_r} \vdash E_2[x] : T_2 \triangleright \vec{\tau}^2 ; \tau ; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt2}}\\ (p^{l_1} : \eta_1) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \tau ; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt1}} \Downarrow_C & C \vdash \rho_1 \sim l_1,\ \rho_d \sim l'_1,\ \eta'_d <: \eta_d\\ (\overline{p}^{l_2} : \eta_2) \cdot (p'^{l_r} : \eta_r) \vDash \tau ; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt2}} \Downarrow_C & C \vdash \rho_2 \sim l_2,\ \rho_r \sim l_r\end{array}$$

Note that the transition rules considered in $\Downarrow_C$ do not take into account the concrete endpoints p, p' and $\overline{p}$—they are existentially quantified in these rules. By Lem. B.3 and the rules of Fig. 4:

$$\begin{array}{ll}C;\ \emptyset \vdash E_1[()] : T_1 \triangleright \vec{\tau}^1 ; \tau ; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt1}} & (p^{l_1} : \eta_1) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \vec{\tau}^1 ; \tau ; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt1}} \Downarrow_C\\ C;\ \emptyset \vdash E_2[p'^{l_r}] : T_2 \triangleright \vec{\tau}^2 ; \tau ; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt2}} & (\overline{p}^{l_2} : \eta_2) \cdot (p'^{l_r} : \eta_r) \vDash \vec{\tau}^2 ; \tau ; \vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt2}} \Downarrow_C\end{array}$$

Therefore $C \Vdash \mathcal{S}'$.

From $C \Vdash_{\mathsf{ws}} \mathcal{S}$ we deduce:

$$\begin{array}{l}C \Vdash_{\mathsf{ws}} \mathcal{S}_0,\ \big((p^{l_1} : !\eta_d.\eta_1) \cdot (p'^{l'_1} : \eta'_d) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash b_1,\ e_1\big),\ \big((\overline{p}^{l_2} : ?\eta_r.\eta_2) \vDash b_2,\ e_2\big)\\ C \Vdash_{\mathsf{ws}} \mathcal{S}_0,\ \big((p'^{l'_1} : \eta'_d) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash b_1,\ e_1\big),\ \big(\epsilon \vDash b_2,\ e_2\big)\\ C \vdash !\eta_d.\eta_1 \bowtie ?\eta_r.\eta_2,\ \eta_1 \bowtie \eta_2 \qquad p, \overline{p} \sharp p', \Delta_1, \mathcal{S}_0 \qquad p' \sharp \Delta_1, \mathcal{S}_0\end{array}$$

where b_1, e_1, b_2 and e_2 are the appropriate behaviours and expressions shown above. Therefore, $C \vdash \eta'_d <: \eta_r$ and from Lem. B.4 we deduce

$$\begin{array}{l}C \Vdash_{\mathsf{ws}} \mathcal{S}_0,\ \big(\Delta_1 \vDash b_1,\ e_1\big),\ \big((p'^{l'_1} : \eta'_d) \cdot \epsilon \vDash b_2,\ e_2\big)\\ \text{and}\ \ C \Vdash_{\mathsf{ws}} \mathcal{S}_0,\ \big((p^{l_1} : \eta_1) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash b_1,\ e_1\big),\ \big((\overline{p}^{l_2} : \eta_2) \cdot (p'^{l_r} : \eta_r) \vDash b_2,\ e_2\big)\end{array}$$

which completes the proof for this case. The rest of the cases are similarly proven.

Lemma B.6. *Suppose $C \Vdash \mathcal{S}$ and $S \longrightarrow \overrightarrow{e'}$. There exists $\mathcal{S}'$ such that $\mathcal{S} \to^C \mathcal{S}'$ and $S' = \overrightarrow{e'}$.*

Proof. By the definitions of the reduction relations ($\rightarrow^C$) and ($\longrightarrow$) in Fig(s). 1 and 6. In this proof the structure of behaviours needed for establishing the ($\rightarrow^C$) reductions are deduced using Lem. B.2 and inversion on the typing rules; the necessary structure of the stacks is deduced by inversion on the rules of the $\Downarrow_C$ relation (Fig. 4).

The proof of preservation (Thm. 5.1) is a direct consequence of the preceding two lemmas.

B.2 Type Soundness

We first extend the notion of internal and communication steps to the reductions of Fig. 6.

Lemma B.7. *Let $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow^C \mathcal{S}'$.*

- *$\mathcal{S} \rightarrow^C_{\mathsf{c}} \mathcal{S}'$ if the transition is derived with use of the rules* TRInit, TRCom, TRDel, TRSel*;*
- *$\mathcal{S} \rightarrow^C_{\mathsf{i}} \mathcal{S}'$ otherwise.*

A diverging process is one that has an infinite sequence of internal transitions ($\longrightarrow_{\mathsf{i}}$).

Definition B.1 (Divergence). *A process P diverges if $P \rightarrow^C_{\mathsf{i}} \mathcal{S}_1 \rightarrow^C_{\mathsf{i}} \mathcal{S}_2 \rightarrow^C_{\mathsf{i}} \mathcal{S}_3 \rightarrow^C_{\mathsf{i}} \ldots$. A system $\mathcal{S}$ diverges if for any $P \in \mathcal{S}$, P diverges.*

These transitions may spawn new processes, and divergence can be the result of an infinite spawn chain.

Example B.1. Let $P \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \big(\epsilon \vDash b,\ (\mathsf{fun}\, f(x) = \mathsf{spawn}\, f)\,()\big)$ where $b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau\,;\tau\,;\mathsf{rec}_\beta\,(\tau\,;\mathsf{spawn}\,\beta)$; P is a diverging process.

To prove progress we first divide a system into its diverging and non-diverging parts. The non-diverging part of the system can only take a finite number of internal transitions.

Lemma B.8. *Let $C \Vdash \mathcal{S}$ and $C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{S}$. Then $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{ND}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ diverges and for some $\mathcal{ND}'$, $\mathcal{ND} \rightarrow^{C\,*}_{\mathsf{i}} \mathcal{ND}' \not\rightarrow^C_{\mathsf{i}}$.*

Proof. By definition of diverging system (and its negation).

The non-diverging part of the system that cannot take any more internal steps consists of processes that are values, or stuck on global channels or session primitives.

Lemma B.9. *Let $C \Vdash \mathcal{ND}$ and $C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{ND}$ and $\mathcal{ND} \not\rightarrow^C_{\mathsf{i}}$. Then $\mathcal{ND} = \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{B}$ and:*

Processes in $\mathcal{F}$ are finished: $\forall\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big) \in \mathcal{F}.\ \Delta = \epsilon, b = \tau, e = v$.
Processes in $\mathcal{W}$ wait on global channels: $\forall\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big) \in \mathcal{W}.\ e = E[\mathsf{req}\text{-}c^l]$ *or* $e = E[\mathsf{acc}\text{-}c^l]$.

Processes in $\mathcal{B}$ block on a session primitive: $\forall P = \big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big) \in \mathcal{B}.\ e = E[e_0]$ *and* $e_0 \in \{\mathsf{send}\, v, \mathsf{recv}\ v, \mathsf{deleg}\ v, \mathsf{resume}\ v, \mathsf{sel}\text{-}L\ v, \mathsf{case}\, v\, \{L_i \Rightarrow e_i\}_{i \in I}\}$.

Proof. If a process in $\mathcal{ND}$ is not in one of the three categories then it would be able to take an internal step. Moreover, the structure of the stack Δ and behaviour b of finished processes follows from $C \Vdash \mathcal{ND}$ and $C \Vdash_{\mathsf{ws}} \mathcal{ND}$.

From the preceding two lemmas we can easily derive the most part of progress.

Corollary B.1. *Let $C \Vdash \mathcal{S}$ and $C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{S}$. Then $\mathcal{S} \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{i}}^{*} (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{B})$ such that:*

Processes in $\mathcal{F}$ are finished: $\forall\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big) \in \mathcal{F}.\ \Delta = \epsilon, b = \tau, e = v$.
Processes in $\mathcal{D}$ diverge: $\forall\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big) \in \mathcal{D}.\ \big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big) \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{i}}^{\infty}$.
Processes in $\mathcal{W}$ wait on global channels: $\forall\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big) \in \mathcal{W}.\ e = E[\mathsf{req}\text{-}c^l]$ *or* $e = E[\mathsf{acc}\text{-}c^l]$.
Processes in $\mathcal{B}$ block on a session primitive: $\forall P = \big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big) \in \mathcal{B}.\ e = E[e_0]$ *and* $e_0 \in \{\mathsf{send}\, v, \mathsf{recv}\ v, \mathsf{deleg}\ v, \mathsf{resume}\ v, \mathsf{sel}\text{-}L\ v, \mathsf{case}\, v\, \{L_i \Rightarrow e_i\}_{i \in I}\}$.

What is missing is that when $\mathcal{S}$ cannot take any more communication steps ($\Rightarrow_{\mathsf{c}}$) then all processes in $\mathcal{B}$ depend on processes in $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{W}$. This follows by well-stackedness of (well-typed) systems. We write $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{B})$ for a system whose finished processes are in $\mathcal{F}$, diverging processes are in $\mathcal{D}$, waiting processes are in $\mathcal{W}$ and blocked processes are in $\mathcal{B}$.

Lemma B.10. *Let $C \Vdash \mathcal{S}$ and $C \Vdash_{ws} \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{B})$ and $\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{B} \not\longrightarrow_{\mathsf{i}}$. Then*

1. *If $P, Q \in \mathcal{W}$ and $P \leftrightharpoons Q$ then $P, Q \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{c}} \mathcal{S}'$, for some $\mathcal{S}'$.*
2. *The $(\mapsto)$ dependencies in $\mathcal{S}$ create a directed acyclic graph.*
3. *If $P \in \mathcal{B}$ then there exist $Q, R \in \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{B}$ such that $P \Mapsto (Q, R)$.*

Proof. The first property follows from $C \Vdash \mathcal{S}$ and $C \Vdash_{\mathsf{ws}} \mathcal{S}$. Property 2 is proven by induction on $C \Vdash_{\mathsf{ws}} \mathcal{S}$.

Property 3: Because $P \in \mathcal{B}$ and P is well-typed, the stack of P is non-empty. Thus, by Property 1, there exists $Q \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $P \mapsto^{+} Q$ is the longest sequence of dependencies *without repetitions* (this is possible because of Property 2). We examine two cases:

- $P \mapsto^{*} P' \mapsto Q$ and the top-level frame in the stack of P' has an endpoint p and $\overline{p}$ appears in the top frame of Q; then $P \leftrightharpoons Q$; therefore $P \Mapsto (P', Q)$.
- $P = P_1 \mapsto \ldots \mapsto P_n \mapsto Q$ and the top-level frame in the stack of P' has an endpoint p and $\overline{p}$ appears in a frame other than the top one in Q; then there exists R such that $Q \mapsto R$ (by $C \Vdash_{\mathsf{ws}} \mathcal{S}$); R cannot be one of the processes $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ because of Property 2. Moreover R cannot be a process in $\mathcal{F}$ (because processes in $\mathcal{F}$ have empty stacks due to typing), and R cannot be any other processes in $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{B}$ because the sequence of dependencies is the longest. Thus this case is not possible. □

Type Soundness is a direct consequence of Cor. B.1 and Lem. B.10.

$$\textsc{TREnd}\quad \frac{\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big),\ \mathcal{S} \to^C \mathcal{S}'}{\big((l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta \vDash b,\ e\big),\ \mathcal{S} \to^C \mathcal{S}'} \qquad \textsc{TRBeta}\quad \frac{C \vdash b' \subseteq \beta \qquad \big(\Delta \vDash b[b'/\beta],\ e\big),\ \mathcal{S} \to^C \mathcal{S}'}{\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ e\big),\ \mathcal{S} \to^C \mathcal{S}'}$$

$$\textsc{TRIft}\quad \frac{}{\big(\Delta \vDash \vec{\tau}\,;\tau\,;(b_1 \oplus b_2)\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}},\ E[\mathsf{if}\,\mathsf{tt}\,\mathsf{then}\,e_1\,\mathsf{else}\,e_2]\big) \to^C \big(\Delta \vDash \vec{\tau}\,;b_1\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}},\ E[e_1]\big)}$$

$$\textsc{TRIff}\quad \frac{}{\big(\Delta \vDash \vec{\tau}\,;\tau\,;(b_1 \oplus b_2)\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}},\ E[\mathsf{if}\,\mathsf{ff}\,\mathsf{then}\,e_1\,\mathsf{else}\,e_2]\big) \to^C \big(\Delta \vDash \vec{\tau}\,;b_2\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}},\ E[e_2]\big)}$$

$$\textsc{TRLet}\quad \frac{}{\big(\Delta \vDash \vec{\tau}\,;\tau\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}},\ E[\mathsf{let}\,x = v\ \mathsf{in}\ e]\big) \to^C \big(\Delta \vDash \vec{\tau}\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}},\ E[e[v/x]]\big)}$$

$$\textsc{TRApp}\quad \frac{}{\big(\Delta \vDash \vec{\tau}\,;\tau\,;\tau\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}},\ E[(\mathsf{fn}\,x \Rightarrow e)\,v]\big) \to^C \big(\Delta \vDash \vec{\tau}\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}},\ E[e[v/x]]\big)}$$

$$\textsc{TRRec}\quad \frac{}{\begin{array}{l}\big(\Delta \vDash \vec{\tau}\,;\tau\,;\tau\,;\mathsf{rec}_\beta\,b\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}},\ E[(\mathsf{fun}\,f(x) = e)\,v]\big)\\ \to^C \big(\Delta \vDash \vec{\tau}\,;b[\mathsf{rec}_\beta\,b/\beta]\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}},\ E[e[\mathsf{fun}\,f(x) = e/f][v/x]]\big)\end{array}}$$

$$\textsc{TRSpn}\quad \frac{}{\big(\Delta \vDash \vec{\tau}\,;\tau\,;(\mathsf{spawn}\,b)\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}},\ E[\mathsf{spawn}\,v]\big),\ \mathcal{S} \to^C \big(\Delta \vDash \vec{\tau}\,;\tau\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt}},\ E[()]\big),\ \big(\epsilon \vDash \tau\,;\tau\,;b,\ v\,()\big),\ \mathcal{S}}$$

$$\textsc{TRInit}\quad \frac{p, \overline{p} \sharp E_1, E_2, \mathcal{S}, \Delta_1, \Delta_2}{\begin{array}{l}\big(\Delta_1 \vDash \vec{\tau}^{\,1}\,;\tau\,;\tau\,;\mathsf{push}(l_1 : \eta_1)\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt1}},\ E_1[\mathsf{req}\text{-}c^{l_1}\,()]\big),\\ \big(\Delta_2 \vDash \vec{\tau}^{\,2}\,;\tau\,;\tau\,;\mathsf{push}(l_2 : \eta_2)\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt2}},\ E_2[\mathsf{acc}\text{-}c^{l_2}\,()]\big),\ \mathcal{S}\\ \to^C \big((p^{l_1} : \eta_1) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \vec{\tau}^{\,1}\,;\tau\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt1}},\ E_1[p^{l_1}]\big),\ \big((\overline{p}^{l_2} : \eta_2) \cdot \Delta_2 \vDash \vec{\tau}^{\,2}\,;\tau\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt2}},\ E_2[\overline{p}^{l_2}]\big),\ \mathcal{S}\end{array}}$$

$$\textsc{TRCom}\quad \frac{}{\begin{array}{l}\big((p^{l_1} : !T_1.\eta_1) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \vec{\tau}^{\,1}\,;\tau\,;\tau\,;\tau\,;\rho_1!T_1'\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt1}},\ E_1[(\mathsf{send}\,(p^{l_1}, v))]\big),\\ \big((\overline{p}^{l_2} : ?T_2.\eta_2) \cdot \Delta_2 \vDash \vec{\tau}^{\,2}\,;\tau\,;\tau\,;\rho_2?T_2'\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt2}},\ E_2[\mathsf{recv}\,\overline{p}^{l_2}]\big),\ \mathcal{S}\\ \to^C \big((p^{l_1} : \eta_1) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \vec{\tau}^{\,1}\,;\tau\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt1}},\ E_1[()]\big),\ \big((\overline{p}^{l_2} : \eta_2) \cdot \Delta_2 \vDash \vec{\tau}^{\,2}\,;\tau\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt2}},\ E_2[v]\big),\ \mathcal{S}\end{array}}$$

$$\textsc{TRDel}\quad \frac{}{\begin{array}{l}\big((p^{l_1} : !\eta_d.\eta_1) \cdot (p'^{l_1'} : \eta_d') \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \vec{\tau}^{\,1}\,;\tau\,;\tau\,;\tau\,;\rho_1!\rho_d\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt1}},\ E_1[\mathsf{deleg}\ (p^{l_1}, p'^{l_1'})]\big),\\ \big((\overline{p}^{l_2} : ?\eta_r.\eta_2) \vDash \vec{\tau}^{\,2}\,;\tau\,;\tau\,;\rho_2?\rho_r\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt2}},\ E_2[\mathsf{resume}^{l_r}\,\overline{p}^{l_2}]\big),\ \mathcal{S}\\ \to^C \big((p^{l_1} : \eta_1) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \vec{\tau}^{\,1}\,;\tau\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt1}},\ E_1[()]\big),\ \big((\overline{p}^{l_2} : \eta_2) \cdot (p'^{l_r} : \eta_r) \vDash \vec{\tau}^{\,2}\,;\tau\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt2}},\ E_2[p'^{l_r}]\big),\ \mathcal{S}\end{array}}$$

$$\textsc{TRSel}\quad \frac{k \in I}{\begin{array}{l}\Big(\Big(p^{l_1} : \oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i\in I}\Big) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \vec{\tau}^{\,1}\,;\tau\,;\tau\,;\rho_1!L_k\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt1}},\ E_1[\mathsf{sel}\text{-}L_k\,p^{l_1}]\Big),\\ \Big(\Big(\overline{p}^{l_2} : \&\{L_i : \eta_i'\}_{i\in(I_1,I_2)}\Big) \cdot \Delta_2 \vDash \vec{\tau}^{\,2}\,;\tau\,;(\&_{j\in J}\rho_2?L_j\,;b_j)\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt2}},\ E_2[\mathsf{case}\,\overline{p}^{l_2}\,\{L_j \Rightarrow e_j\}_{j\in J}]\Big),\ \mathcal{S}\\ \to^C \big((p^{l_1} : \eta_k) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \vec{\tau}^{\,1}\,;\tau\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt1}},\ E_1[()]\big),\ \big((\overline{p}^{l_2} : \eta_k') \cdot \Delta_2 \vDash \vec{\tau}^{\,2}\,;b_k\,;\vec{b}_{\mathsf{nxt2}},\ E_2[e_k]\big),\ \mathcal{S}\end{array}}$$

Fig. 6. Typed Reductions.

C Inference algorithms

The algorithm to infer session types at second level of our type system is called Algorithm $\mathcal{SI}$, and it operates on a syntactical sub-language of session types called *session structures*, which is defined as follows:

$$\eta ::= \psi \mid \mathsf{end} \mid !T.\eta \mid ?T.\eta \mid !\eta.\eta \mid ?\eta.\eta \mid \psi_{\mathsf{in}} \mid \psi_{\mathsf{ex}}$$

Internal and external choices are removed from the syntax of sessions. In their place, we have two special variables ψ_{in} and ψ_{ex}. These variables are bound by special *choice constraints*, which extend the syntax of Constraints in Fig. 2 as follows:

$$C ::= \ldots \mid \bigoplus_{i \in I} \{L_i : \eta_i\} \sim \psi_{\mathsf{in}} \mid \&_{i \in (I_1, I_2)} \{L_i : \eta_i\} \sim \psi_{\mathsf{ex}}$$

During session inference, the constraint set C might be refined to a new set C', containing more precise session types for ψ_{in} and ψ_{ex} (for example by adding new labels to an internal choice, or by moving an active label to inactive in an external choice), or new constraints on types (because of a $\rho!\mathsf{Int}$ behaviour for example). Choice constraints in C are ordered according to subtyping:

$$\textsc{Inf-IChoice}\ \frac{C \vdash \psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \eta \quad C \vdash \eta <: \eta'}{C \vdash \psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \eta'}$$

$$\textsc{Inf-EChoice}\ \frac{C \vdash \psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \eta \quad C \vdash \eta <: \eta'}{C \vdash \psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \eta'}$$

Abstract interpretation transitions can be naturally extended to the sub-language just presented, except for the two cases when b pops a label L_k, and the top of the stack contains either ψ_{in} or ψ_{ex}. In these two cases, if $C \vdash \psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \eta$ or $C \vdash \psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \eta$, η substitutes ψ_{ex} or ψ_{in} on the stack.

Section C.1 presents the main inference algorithm for Stage 2, whose main core is Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ in Section C.2. Sections C.3 and C.4 contains the auxiliary functions for session sub-type inference. Section C.5 shows the inference algorithm for Stage 3.

As stated in Sec. 6, the definition of Algorithm $\mathcal{W}$ can be adapted straightforwardly from [1], and therefore its definition is not included. The soundness of Algorithm $\mathcal{W}$ can be stated as follows:

Theorem C.1 (Soundness of Algorithm $\mathcal{W}$). *If $\mathcal{W}([], e) = (\sigma, t, b, C)$ then $C;\ [] \vdash_{\mathsf{n}} e : t \triangleright b$.*

Regarding completeness, let $jdg^\star$ be any valid typing judgement for an expression e. Completeness first show that Algorithm $\mathcal{W}$ always calculates a judgment jdg for e. Moreover it also shows that $jdg^\star$ is a *lazy instance* of jdg: in the sense that there exists a substitution σ' such that $jdg^\star$ can always be derived by further instantiating jdg with σ' and by subtyping. This second property points to the fact that $\mathcal{W}$ calculates *principal types* for e (see [1], Sec. 1.5.1, p.30). Completeness is stated as follows:

Theorem C.2 (Completeness of Algorithm $\mathcal{W}$). *If* $C^\star;\ [] \vdash^{\mathsf{at}}_{\mathsf{n}} e : t^\star \triangleright b^\star$ *with* $C^\star$ *atomic (i.e. all type constraints in* $C^\star$ *have the form* $\alpha_1 \subseteq \alpha_2$*), then* $\mathcal{W}([], e) = (\sigma, b, t, C)$ *and there exists a substitution* $\sigma^\star$ *such that:*

- $C^\star \vdash C\sigma^\star$
- $C^\star \vdash b\sigma^\star \subseteq b^\star$
- $C^\star \vdash t\sigma^\star <: t^\star$

C.1 Algorithm $\mathcal{SI}$

Let K be the behavior stack, defined by the following grammar:

$$K ::= \epsilon \mid b \cdot K$$

Let also the application of K to b, or $K[b]$, be defined inductively as follows:

$$\epsilon[b] = b$$
$$(b' \cdot K)[b] = K[b; b']$$

Since we only work with finite behaviors b, there is always a finite decomposition $b = K[b']$ such that b' is not the sequential composition of two sub-behaviors; the decomposition is also unique. The session inference algorithm $\mathcal{SI}$ is defined as follows:

$\mathcal{SI}(b,\ C) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1,\ C_2)$
  if $(\sigma_1, C_1) = \mathcal{MC}(\epsilon \vDash b,\ C,\ \epsilon)$
  and $(\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathsf{choiceVarSubst}\ C_1$

$\mathsf{choiceVarSubst}\ (C \uplus \overrightarrow{\{\eta_i \subseteq \psi_{\mathsf{in}_i}\}} \uplus \overrightarrow{\{\eta_j \subseteq \psi_{\mathsf{ex}_j}\}}) = (\sigma, C\sigma)$
  if $\sigma = \overrightarrow{[\psi_{\mathsf{in}_i} \mapsto \eta_i]}\overrightarrow{[\psi_{\mathsf{ex}_j} \mapsto \eta_j]}$
  and $\psi_{\mathsf{in}}, \psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sharp RHS(C)$ for any $\psi_{\mathsf{in}}, \psi_{\mathsf{ex}}$

C.2 Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$

-- remove terminated frames
$\mathcal{MC}((l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta \vDash b,\ C,\ K) = \mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash b,\ C,\ K)$

-- $\mathcal{MC}$ terminates with behavior τ
$\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash \tau,\ C,\ \epsilon) = (\sigma,\ C\sigma)$
  if $\sigma = \mathsf{finalize}\ \Delta$

-- pop a sub-behavior from the continuation stack
$\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash \tau,\ C,\ b \cdot K) = \mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash b,\ C,\ K)$

-- push a new frame on the stack
$\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash \mathsf{push}(l : \eta),\ C,\ K) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$
  if $(\sigma_1, \Delta_1) = \mathsf{checkFresh}(l, \Delta)$

```
  and (σ2, C2) = MC((l : ησ1) · Δ1 ⊨ τ, Cσ1, Kσ1)

-- send
MC((l : ψ) · Δ ⊨ ρ!T, C, K) = (σ2σ1, C2)
  if   C ⊢ l ~ ρ
  and σ1 = [ψ ↦ !α.ψ'] where α, ψ' fresh
  and (σ2, C2) = MC((l : ψ') · Δσ1 ⊨ τ, Cσ1 ∪ {T ⊆ α}, Kσ1)

MC((l : !α.η) · Δ ⊨ ρ!T, C, K) = MC((l : η) · Δ ⊨ τ, C ∪ {T ⊆ α}, K)
  if   C ⊢ l ~ ρ

-- recv
MC((l : ψ) · Δ ⊨ ρ?T, C, K) = (σ2σ1, C2)
  if   C ⊢ l ~ ρ
  and σ1 = [ψ ↦ ?α.ψ'] where α, ψ' fresh
  and (σ2, C2) = MC((l : ψ') · Δσ1 ⊨ τ, Cσ1 ∪ {α ⊆ T}, Kσ1)

MC((l : ?α.η) · Δ ⊨ ρ?T, C, K) = MC((l : η) · Δ ⊨ τ, C ∪ {α ⊆ T}, K)
  if C ⊢ l ~ ρ

-- delegation
MC((l : ψ) · (ld : ηd) · Δ ⊨ ρ!ρd, C, K) = (σ2σ1, C2)
  if C ⊢ l ~ ρ and C ⊢ ld ~ ρd
  and σ1 = [ψ ↦ !ηd.ψ'] where ψ' fresh
  and (σ2, C2) = MC((l : ψ') · Δσ ⊨ τ, Cσ1, Kσ1)

MC((l : !ηd.η) · (ld : η'd) · Δ ⊨ ρ!ρd, C, K) = (σ2σ1, C2)
  if   C ⊢ l ~ ρ and C ⊢ ld ~ ρd
  and (σ1, C1) =  sub(η'd, ηd, C)
  and (σ2, C2) = MC((l : η) · Δσ ⊨ τ, C1, Kσ1)

MC((l : η) · (ld : η'd) · Δ ⊨ ρ!ρd, C, K) = (σ2σ1, C2)
  if   C ⊢ ld ⊁ ρd
  and (σ1, Δ1) = checkFresh(ld, (l : η) · (ld : η'd) · Δ)
  and (σ2, C2) = MC(Δ1 ⊨ ρ!ρd, Cσ1, Kσ1)

-- resume
MC((l : ψ) · ϵ ⊨ ρ?lr, C, K) = (σ2σ1, C2)
  if   C ⊢ l ~ ρ and l ≠ lr
  and σ1 = [ψ ↦ ?ψ'r.ψ'] where ψ', ψ'r fresh
  and (σ2, C2) = MC((l : ψ') · (lr : ψ'r) · ϵ ⊨ τ, Cσ1, Kσ1)

MC((l : ?ηr.η) · ϵ ⊨ ρ?lr, C, K) = MC((l : η) · (lr : ηr) · ϵ ⊨ τ, C, K)
  if C ⊢ l ~ ρ and l ≠ lr

MC((l : ?η) · (ld : ηd) · Δ ⊨ ρ?lr, C, K) = (σ2σ1, C2)
  if   (σ1, Δ1) = checkFresh(ld, (l : ?η) · (ld : ηd) · Δ)
  and (σ2, C2) = MC(Δ1 ⊨ ρ?lr, Cσ1, Kσ1)

-- in. choice
```

$$\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi)\cdot\Delta \vDash \rho!L_k,\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$$
  if $C \vdash l \sim \rho$
  and $\sigma_1 = [\psi \mapsto \psi_{\mathsf{in}}]$ where $\psi_k, \psi_{\mathsf{in}}$ fresh
  and $(\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi_k)\cdot\Delta\sigma \vDash \tau,\ C\sigma_1 \cup \{\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \oplus_{j\in\{k\}}\{L_j : \psi_j\}\},\ K\sigma_1\big)$

$$\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi_{\mathsf{in}})\cdot\Delta \vDash \rho!L_i,\ C,\ K\big) = \mathcal{MC}\big((l:\eta_i)\cdot\Delta \vDash \tau,\ C,\ K\big)$$
  if $C \vdash l \sim \rho$
  and $i \in J$ and $(\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \oplus_{j\in J}\{L_j : \eta_j\}) \in C$

$$\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi_{\mathsf{in}})\cdot\Delta \vDash \rho!L_i,\ C,\ K\big) = \mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi_i)\cdot\Delta \vDash \tau,\ C' \uplus \{\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \oplus_{j\in J,i}\{L_j : \eta_j\}\},\ K\big)$$
  if $C \vdash l \sim \rho$
  and $i \notin J$ and $C = C' \uplus \{\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \oplus_{j\in J}\{L_j : \eta_j\}\}$ and $\eta_i = \psi_i$ fresh

-- *ex. choice*
$$\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi)\cdot\Delta \vDash \&_{i\in I}\{\rho?L_i\,;b_i\},\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$$
  if $C \vdash l \sim \rho$
  and $\sigma_1 = [\psi \mapsto \psi_{\mathsf{ex}}]$ where ψ_{ex} fresh
  and $C_1 = \{\psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \&\{L_i : \psi_i\}_{i\in(I,\emptyset)}\}$ where $\overrightarrow{\psi_i}$ fresh
  and $(\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi_{\mathsf{ex}})\cdot\Delta\sigma_1 \vDash (\&_{i\in I}\{\rho?L_i\,;b_i\})\sigma_1,\ C\sigma_1 \cup C_1,\ K\sigma_1\big)$

$$\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi_{\mathsf{ex}})\cdot\Delta \vDash \&_{j\in I_1\uplus I_2\uplus I_3}\rho?L_j\,;b_j,\ C,\ K\big) = \mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi_{\mathsf{ex}})\cdot\Delta \vDash \&_{j\in I_1\uplus I_2\uplus I_3}\rho?L_j\,;b_j,\ C_1,\ K\big)$$
  if $C \vdash l \sim \rho$
  and $C = C' \uplus \{\psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \&\{L_j : \eta_j\}_{j\in(I_1J_1,I_2J_2)}\}$ and $I_3 \sharp J_1 \uplus J_2$ and $I_3, J_1 \neq \emptyset$
  and $C_1 = C' \cup \{\psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i\in(I_1,I_2I_3J_1J_2)}\}$

$$\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi_{\mathsf{ex}})\cdot\Delta \vDash \&_{i\in I}\rho?L_i\,;b_i,\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_n\ldots\sigma_0, C_n)$$
  if $C \vdash l \sim \rho$ and $J_1 \subseteq I$ and $I \subseteq J_1 \uplus J_2$
  and $C = C' \uplus \{\psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \&\{L_j : \eta_j\}_{j\in(J_1,J_2)}\}$
  and for each $k \in [1\ldots n]$ where $I = \{L_{j_1},\ldots,L_{j_n}\}$ and $n \geq 0$
    $(\sigma_k, C_k) = \mathcal{MC}\big(((l:\eta_{j_k})\cdot\Delta \vDash b_{j_k})\sigma_{k-1}\ldots\sigma_0,\ C_{k-1},\ K\sigma_{k-1}\ldots\sigma_0\big)$
      where $\sigma_0 = \sigma_{id}$ and $C_0 = C$

-- *sequencing*
$$\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b_1\,;b_2,\ C,\ K\big) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b_1,\ C,\ b_2\cdot K\big)$$

-- *internal choice in the behavior*
$$\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b_1 \oplus b_2,\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$$
  if $(\sigma_1, C_1) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b_1,\ C,\ K\big)$
  and $(\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta\sigma_1 \vDash b_2\sigma_1,\ C_1,\ K\sigma_1\big)$

-- *spawn*
$$\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash \mathsf{spawn}\, b,\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$$

$$\quad \text{if} \quad (\sigma_1, C_1) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\epsilon \vDash b,\ C,\ \epsilon\big)$$
$$\quad \text{and}\ (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta\sigma_1 \vDash \tau,\ C_1,\ K\sigma_1\big)$$

$$-\!- \textit{ rec}$$
$$\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash \mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b,\ C) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$$
$$\quad \text{if} \quad C = C' \uplus \{b' \subseteq \beta\}$$
$$\quad \text{and}\ (\sigma_1, C_1) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\epsilon \vDash b,\ C' \cup \{\tau \subseteq \beta\},\ \epsilon\big)$$
$$\quad \text{and}\ (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta\sigma_1 \vDash \tau,\ (C_1 \backslash \{\tau \subseteq \beta\}) \cup (\{b' \subseteq \beta\})\sigma_1,\ K\sigma_1\big)$$

$$-\!- \textit{ behavior variable}$$
$$\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash \beta,\ C,\ K\big) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ C,\ K\big)$$
$$\quad \text{where}\ \ b = \bigoplus\{b_i \mid \exists i.\ (b_i \subseteq \beta) \in C\}$$

$$-\!- \textit{ try to close the top session if all previous clauses fail}$$
$$\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$$
$$\quad \text{if} \quad (\sigma_1, \Delta_1) = \mathsf{closeTop}(\Delta)$$
$$\quad \text{and}\ (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta_1 \vDash b\sigma_1,\ C\sigma_1,\ K\sigma_1\big)$$

C.3 Helper functions

$$-\!- \textit{ checkFresh forces frame } l \textit{ in the input stack to be the closed session}$$
$$\mathsf{checkFresh}(l, \epsilon) = (\sigma_{id}, \epsilon)$$
$$\mathsf{checkFresh}(l, (l' : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta) = (\sigma_{id}, \Delta)$$
$$\mathsf{checkFresh}(l, (l : \psi) \cdot \Delta) = ([\psi \mapsto \mathsf{end}], \Delta[\psi \mapsto \mathsf{end}])$$
$$\mathsf{checkFresh}(l, (l' : \eta) \cdot \Delta) = (\sigma, (l' : \eta\sigma) \cdot \Delta')$$
$$\quad \text{if}\ \ l' \neq l \ \text{and}\ (\sigma, \Delta') = \mathsf{checkFresh}(l, \Delta)$$

$$-\!- \ \mathsf{closeTop} \textit{ forces the top of the stack to be } \mathsf{end}$$
$$\mathsf{closeTop}((l : \eta) \cdot \Delta) = \mathsf{checkFresh}(l, (l : \eta) \cdot \Delta)$$

$$-\!- \ \mathsf{finalize} \textit{ matches the input stack with the empty stack}$$
$$\mathsf{finalize}\quad \epsilon = \sigma_{id}$$
$$\mathsf{finalize}\quad (l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta = \mathsf{finalize}\ \Delta$$
$$\mathsf{finalize}\quad (l : \psi) \cdot \Delta = \sigma_2\sigma_1$$
$$\quad \text{if} \quad \sigma_1 = [\psi \mapsto \mathsf{end}]$$
$$\quad \text{and}\ \sigma_2 = \mathsf{finalize}(\Delta)$$

C.4 Subtype checking

$$-\!- \textit{ end}$$
$$\mathsf{sub}(\mathsf{end}, \mathsf{end}, C) = (\sigma_{id}, C)$$

$$-\!- \textit{ send/recv}$$
$$\mathsf{sub}(!T_1.\eta_1, !T_2.\eta_2, C) = (\sigma_1, C_1 \cup \{T_2 \subseteq T_1\})$$
$$\quad \text{if} \quad (\sigma_1, C_1) = \mathsf{sub}(\eta_1, \eta_2, C)$$

$$\mathsf{sub}(?T_1.\eta_1, ?T_2.\eta_2, C) = (\sigma_1, C_1 \cup \{T_1 \subseteq T_2\})$$
$$\quad \text{if} \quad (\sigma_1, C_1) = \mathsf{sub}(\eta_1, \eta_2, C)$$

$$-\!- \textit{ deleg/resume}$$

$$\mathsf{sub}(!\eta_{d1}.\eta_1, !\eta_{d2}.\eta_2, C) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$$
$$\quad \text{if} \quad (\sigma_1, C_1) = \mathsf{sub}(\eta_{d2}, \eta_{d1}, C) \text{ and } (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathsf{sub}(\eta_1\sigma_1, \eta_2\sigma_1, C_1)$$

$$\mathsf{sub}(?\eta_{r1}.\eta_1, ?\eta_{r2}.\eta_2, C) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$$
$$\quad \text{if} \quad (\sigma_1, C_1) = \mathsf{sub}(\eta_{r1}, \eta_{r2}, C) \text{ and } (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathsf{sub}(\eta_1\sigma_1, \eta_2\sigma_1, C_1)$$

$$-\!- \textit{ in. choice}$$
$$\mathsf{sub}(\psi_{\mathsf{in}_1}, \psi_{\mathsf{in}_2}, C) = \mathsf{f}\ (I_2, C)$$
$$\quad \text{if} \quad (\psi_{\mathsf{in}_2} \sim \bigoplus_{i\in I_2}\{L_i : \eta_{2i}\}) \in C$$
$$\quad \text{and } \mathsf{f}\ (\emptyset, C) = (\sigma_{id}, C)$$
$$\quad \text{and } \mathsf{f}\ (I \uplus \{k\}, C) = \mathsf{f}\ (I \uplus \{k\}, C_1)$$
$$\qquad \text{if} \quad C = C' \uplus (\psi_{\mathsf{in}_1} \sim \bigoplus_{i\in I_1}\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}) \uplus (\psi_{\mathsf{in}_2} \sim \bigoplus_{i\in I_2}\{L_i : \eta_{2i}\})$$
$$\qquad \text{and } k \notin I_1 \text{ and } k \in I_2$$
$$\qquad \text{and } C_1 = C' \uplus (\psi_{\mathsf{in}_1} \sim \bigoplus_{i\in I_1\cup\{k\}}\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\} \oplus \eta_{2_k}) \uplus (\psi_{\mathsf{in}_2} \sim \bigoplus_{i\in I_2}\{L_i : \eta_{2i}\})$$
$$\quad \text{and } \mathsf{f}\ (I \uplus \{k\}, C) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$$
$$\qquad \text{if} \quad (\sigma_1, C_1) = \mathsf{f}\ (I, C)$$
$$\qquad \text{and } (\psi_{\mathsf{in}_1} \sim \bigoplus_{i\in I_1}\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}), (\psi_{\mathsf{in}_2} \sim \bigoplus_{i\in I_2}\{L_i : \eta_{2i}\}) \in C_1$$
$$\qquad \text{and } k \in I_1 \text{ and } k \in I_2$$
$$\qquad \text{and } (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathsf{sub}\ (\eta_{1k}\sigma_1, \eta_{2k}\sigma_1, C_1)$$

$$-\!- \textit{ ex. choice}$$
$$\mathsf{sub}(\psi_{\mathsf{ex}_1}, \psi_{\mathsf{ex}_2}, C) = \mathsf{f}\ (J_1 \cup J_2, C)$$
$$\quad \text{if} \quad (\psi_{\mathsf{ex}_1} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}_{i\in(I_1,I_2)}), (\psi_{\mathsf{ex}_2} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_{2i}\}_{i\in(J_1,J_2)}) \in C$$
$$\quad \text{and } I_1 \subseteq J_1$$
$$\quad \text{and } \mathsf{f}\ (\emptyset, C) = (\sigma_{id}, C)$$
$$\quad \text{and } \mathsf{f}\ (I \cup \{k\}, C) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$$
$$\qquad \text{if} \quad (\psi_{\mathsf{ex}_1} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}_{i\in(I_1,I_2)}), (\psi_{\mathsf{ex}_2} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_{2i}\}_{i\in(J_1,J_2)}) \in C$$
$$\qquad \text{and } (k \in I_2 \text{ or } (k \in I_1 \text{ and } k \in J_1)$$
$$\qquad \text{and } (\sigma_1, C_1) = \mathsf{f}\ (I, C)$$
$$\qquad \text{and } (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathsf{sub}\ (\eta_{1k}\sigma_1, \eta_{2k}\sigma_1, C_1)$$
$$\quad \text{and } \mathsf{f}\ (I \cup \{k\}, C) = \mathsf{f}\ (I \cup \{k\}, C_1)$$
$$\qquad \text{if} \quad C = C' \uplus (\psi_{\mathsf{ex}_1} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}_{i\in(I_1,I_2)}) \uplus (\psi_{\mathsf{ex}_2} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_{2i}\}_{i\in(J_1,J_2)})$$
$$\qquad \text{and } k \in I_1 \text{ and } k \in J_2$$
$$\qquad \text{and } C_1 = C' \uplus (\psi_{\mathsf{ex}_1} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}_{i\in(I_1\setminus\{k\},I_2\cup\{k\})}) \uplus (\psi_{\mathsf{ex}_2} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_{2i}\}_{i\in(J_1,J_2)})$$
$$\quad \text{and } \mathsf{f}\ (I \cup \{k\}, C) = \mathsf{f}\ (I \cup \{k\}, C_1)$$
$$\qquad \text{if} \quad C = C' \uplus (\psi_{\mathsf{ex}_1} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}_{i\in(I_1,I_2)}) \uplus (\psi_{\mathsf{ex}_2} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_{2i}\}_{i\in(J_1,J_2)})$$
$$\qquad \text{and } k \notin I_1 \text{ and } k \notin I_2$$
$$\qquad \text{and } C_1 = C' \uplus (\psi_{\mathsf{ex}_1} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}_{i\in(I_1,I_2\cup\{k\})} + ?L_k.\eta_{2k}) \uplus (\psi_{\mathsf{ex}_2} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_{2i}\}_{i\in(J_1,J_2)})$$

$$-\!- \textit{ session inference}$$
$$\mathsf{sub}(\psi, \eta, C) = (\sigma, C\sigma) \text{ if } \sigma = [\psi \mapsto \eta]$$
$$\mathsf{sub}(\eta, \psi, C) = (\sigma, C\sigma) \text{ if } \sigma = [\psi \mapsto \eta]$$

C.5 Algorithm $\mathcal{D}$

The duality check algorithm, which we call Algorithm $\mathcal{D}$, takes the constraints set C calculated by the second stage, and returns a larger constraints set C'. As in Nielson& Nielson, the algorithm simply halts when a duality check fails, rather than throwing an exception.

Algorithm $\mathcal{D}$ manipulates a new kind of constraints, called *duality constraints*. A duality constraint has the form $(\eta_1 \bowtie \eta_2)$, where η_1 and η_2 are inference session types. At the beginning, Algorithm $\mathcal{DC}$ creates a duality constraint $\eta_1 \bowtie \eta_2$ for each channel c and $\bar{c}$ such that session types η_1 and η_2 have been derived, i.e. such that $\{\eta_1 \subseteq c, \eta_2 \subseteq \bar{c}\} \in C$. For any other channel c such that $\{\eta_1 \subseteq c\}$ is in C, but no constraint $\{\eta_2 \subseteq \bar{c}\}$ is in C, Algorithm $\mathcal{DC}$ introduces a constraint $\eta_1 \bowtie \psi_2$, where ψ_2 is a fresh variable.

After this initial setup, Algorithm $\mathcal{DC}$ non-deterministically applies one of the following rules to the configuration (σ_{id}, C), until no more rules can be applied:

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
(\sigma, C \uplus \{\mathsf{end} \bowtie \mathsf{end}\}) & \hookrightarrow (\sigma, C) & \\
(\sigma, C \uplus \{!T_1.\eta_1 \bowtie ?T_2.\eta_2\}) & \hookrightarrow (\sigma, C \cup \{T_1 \subseteq T_2, \eta_1 \bowtie \eta_2\}) & \\
(\sigma, C \uplus \{!\eta_1'.\eta_1 \bowtie ?\eta_2'.\eta_2\}) & \hookrightarrow (\sigma'\sigma, C' \cup \{\eta_1\sigma' \bowtie \eta_2\sigma'\}) & \text{if } (\sigma', C') = \mathsf{sub}(C, \eta_1, \eta_2) \\
(\sigma, C \uplus \{\bigoplus_{i\in I_0}\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\} \bowtie \&\{L_i : \eta_{2i}\}_{i\in(I_1,I_2)}\}) & \hookrightarrow (\sigma, C \cup \bigcup_{i\in I_0}\{\eta_{1i} \bowtie \eta_{2i}\}) & \text{if } I_0 \subseteq I_1 \\
(\sigma, C \cup \{\psi_1 \bowtie \eta_2\}) & \hookrightarrow (\sigma'\sigma, C') & \text{if } (\sigma', C') = \mathsf{expand}(C, \psi_1 \bowtie \eta_2) \\
(\sigma, C \cup \{\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \bowtie \eta_2\}) & \hookrightarrow (\sigma'\sigma, C') & \text{if } (\sigma', C') = \mathsf{expand}(C, \psi_{\mathsf{in}} \bowtie \eta_2) \\
(\sigma, C \cup \{\psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \bowtie \eta_2\}) & \hookrightarrow (\sigma'\sigma, C') & \text{if } (\sigma', C') = \mathsf{expand}(C, \psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \bowtie \eta_2)
\end{array}
$$

where the helper function sub is the same function from Algorithm $\mathcal{SI}$ (which returns a substitution and a set of constraints such that the two input sessions are in the subtyping relation). The helper function expand is defined as follows:

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\mathsf{expand}(C, \psi_1 \bowtie \mathsf{end}) & = (\sigma, C\sigma) & \text{if } \sigma = [\psi_1 \mapsto \mathsf{end}] \\
\mathsf{expand}(C, \psi_1 \bowtie ?T.\eta_2) & = (\sigma, C\sigma) & \text{if } \sigma = [\psi_1 \mapsto !\alpha.\eta_2] \\
\mathsf{expand}(C, \psi_1 \bowtie !T.\eta_2) & = (\sigma, C\sigma) & \text{if } \sigma = [\psi_1 \mapsto ?\alpha.\eta_2] \\
\mathsf{expand}(C, \psi_1 \bowtie !\eta_2'.\eta_2) & = (\sigma, C\sigma) & \text{if } \sigma = [\psi_1 \mapsto !\psi_1'.\psi_1''] \\
\mathsf{expand}(C, \psi_1 \bowtie ?\eta_2'.\eta_2) & = (\sigma, C\sigma) & \text{if } \sigma = [\psi_1 \mapsto ?\psi_1'.\psi_1''] \\
\mathsf{expand}(C, \psi_1 \bowtie \bigoplus_{i\in I}\{L_i : \eta_{2i}\}) & = (\sigma, C\sigma \cup C') & \text{if } \sigma = [\psi_1 \mapsto \psi_{\mathsf{ex}}] \text{ and } C' = \{\psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \&\{L_i : \psi_{2i}\}_{i\in(I,\emptyset)}\} \\
\mathsf{expand}(C, \psi_1 \bowtie \&\{L_i : \eta_{2i}\}_{i\in(I_1,I_2)}) & = (\sigma, C\sigma \cup C') & \text{if } \sigma = [\psi_1 \mapsto \psi_{\mathsf{in}}] \text{ and } C' = \{\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \bigoplus_{i\in I_1}\{L_i : \psi_{2i}\}\} \\
\mathsf{expand}(C, \psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \bowtie \bigoplus_{i\in I_0}\{L_i : \eta_{2i}\}) & = (\sigma_{id}, C') & \text{if } \quad C = C'' \cup \{\psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}_{i\in(I_1,I_2)}\} \\
 & & \text{and } C' = C'' \cup \{\psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}_{i\in(I_1\cup I_0, I_2\setminus I_0)}\} \cup \bigcup_{i\in I_0}\{\eta_{1i} \bowtie \eta_{2i}\} \\
\mathsf{expand}(C, \psi_{\mathsf{in}} \bowtie \&\{L_i : \eta_{2i}\}_{i\in(I_1,I_2)}) & = (\sigma_{id}, C') & \text{if } \quad C = C'' \cup \{\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \bigoplus_{i\in I_0}\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}\} \\
 & & \text{and } C' = C'' \cup \{\psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \bigoplus_{i\in(I_0\setminus I_2)\cap I_1}\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}\} \cup \bigcup_{i\in I_0\cap I_1}\{\eta_{1i} \bowtie \eta_{2i}\} \\
\mathsf{expand}(C, \psi_{\mathsf{in}} \bowtie \psi_{\mathsf{ex}}) & = (\sigma_{id}, C') & \text{if } \quad C = C'' \cup \{\bigoplus_{i\in I_0}\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\} \subseteq \psi_{\mathsf{in}}\} \cup \{\&\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}_{i\in(I_1,I_2)} \subseteq \psi_{\mathsf{ex}}\} \\
 & & \text{and } C' = C'' \cup \{\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \bigoplus_{i\in(I_0\setminus I_2)\cup I_1}\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}\} \cup \{\psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}\}_{i\in(I_1\cap(I_0\setminus I_2), I_2\cup(I_0\setminus I_1))}
\end{array}
$$

$$\cup \bigcup_{i \in (I_0 \setminus I_2) \cap I_1} \{\eta_{1i} \bowtie \eta_{2i}\}$$

where all $\alpha, \psi, \psi_{\mathsf{in}}, \psi_{\mathsf{ex}}$ variables on the right-hand side are fresh, and where fresh variables ψ_{1i} and ψ_{2i} are generated, in case index i is not defined in the starting internal or external choice. Symmetric rules are omitted.

The duality constraints are increasingly simplified, until no more simplifications are possible. After Algorithm $\mathcal{DC}$ is finished, the input set C fails the duality check when there exists a duality constraint $C\eta_1 \bowtie \eta_2$ such that neither η_1 or η_2 are fresh session type variables ψ, i.e. $\eta_1 \neq \psi_1$ and $\eta_2 \neq \psi_2$.

D Finiteness of Abstract Interpretation

D.1 Introduction

This section proves that the abstract interpretation of a configuration $\Delta \vDash b$ in a well-formed environment C always generates a finite state-space. We first formalize the notion of *behaviour compact* from Definition 5.1. Then we define a translation from behaviours with β variables to *ground behaviours*, i.e. behaviours without βs. We show that this translation is fully abstract with reference to the abstract interpretation semantics. Finally, we show that a configuration $\Delta \vDash b$ and constraints C generate a finite state-space when b is ground and C is well-formed.

D.2 Finite ground behaviors

In order to show termination of $\mathcal{MC}$, we show that β variables can always be represented by an equivalent *finite* behaviour when C is well-formed.

Consider the following ordering:

Definition D.1 (Behaviour ordering). *For any constraints set C and behaviour b, the* behaviour ordering $(C, b) \succ (C', b')$ *is defined by the following equations:*

$$
\begin{aligned}
(C, b_1 ; b_2) &\succ (C, b_i) && \text{for } i \in \{1, 2\} \\
(C, b_1 \oplus b_2) &\succ (C, b_i) && \text{for } i \in \{1, 2\} \\
(C, \mathsf{spawn}\, b) &\succ (C, b) \\
(C, \underset{i \in I}{\&} \{\rho ? L_i ; b_i\}) &\succ (C, b_i) && \text{for } i \in I \\
(C, \beta) &\succ (C, b) && \text{if } \{b \subseteq \beta\} \in C \\
(C \uplus \{b' \subseteq \beta\}, \mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b) &\succ (C \cup \{\tau \subseteq \beta\}, b)
\end{aligned}
$$

Notice that a behaviour b structurally decreases on the right-hand side of $\succ$, except when b is a behaviour variable β. When C is not well-formed, a behaviour variable might occur infinitely often in a chain of $\succ$ relations. Such is the case when $b = \beta$ and $C = \{\beta \subseteq \beta\}$, since the pair (C, β) gives rise to the infinite chain:

$$(C, \beta) \succ (C, \beta) \succ (C, \beta) \succ \ldots$$

However, it can be shown that there is no infinite chain when C is well-formed. The reason for this is that in a well-formed C, any cycle on behaviour constraints must include a recursive constraint of the form $(\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b \subseteq \beta')$. The definition of $\succ$ replaces such constraints with the dummy constraint $(\tau \subseteq \beta)$, effectively breaking the constraint cycle. Since a well-formed C is a finite set, eventually there are no more cycles in C.

This property is crucial to demonstrate that behaviours have a finite representation in a well-formed C, and it can be proved as follows:

Lemma D.1 (Well-foundedness of $\succ$). *If C is well-defined, then $\succ$ is well-founded.*

Proof. We need to show that there are no infinite descending chains in $\succ$, i.e. for any pair (C, b) there are no infinite sequences of the following kind:

$$(C, b) \succ (C_1, b_1) \succ (C_2, b_2) \succ \ldots \succ (C_i, b_i) \succ \ldots$$

We prove the lemma by contradiction. Suppose that there is indeed such an infinite descending chain in $\succ$. Let $\mathcal{I} = \{\, i \mid \exists \beta. b_i = \beta \,\}$ There are two cases to consider: either $\mathcal{I}$ is finite, i.e. β variables occur a finite number of times in the infinite chain, or $\mathcal{I}$ is infinite, i.e. β variables occur infinitely often.

If $\mathcal{I}$ is finite, let k be the least element in $\mathcal{I}$. By definition, b_k is the last behaviour in the infinite chain such that $b_k = \beta_k$ for some β_k. By well-formedness of C, C contains the constraint $(b_{k+1} \subseteq \beta_k)$ and b_{k+1} is a finite, well-defined term. Since b_{k+1} is finite and b_j is not a variable for $j > k$, then the chain must be finite, because $\succ$ structurally decreases b at every step. This contradicts the assumption that there is an infinite chain in $\succ$, and the lemma is proved.

If $\mathcal{I}$ is infinite, then the set $\mathcal{B} = \{\, b_i \mid \exists \beta. b_i = \beta \,\}$ (the set of all behaviour variables occurring in the chain) must be finite, because there are only a finite number of constraints $(b \subseteq \beta)$ in a well-formed C. Because this set is finite, by the pigeonhole principle there exist b_i and b_j in the infinite chain such that $b_i = b_j = \beta$ for some β. This can be illustrated as follows:

$$(C, b) \succ \ldots \succ (C_i, \beta) \succ \ldots \succ (C_k, b_k) \succ (C_{k+1}, b_{k+1}) \succ \ldots \succ (C_j, \beta) \succ \ldots$$

This sequence contains a cycle over β:

$$(C_i, \beta) \succ \ldots \succ (C_k, b_k) \succ (C_{k+1}, b_{k+1}) \succ \ldots \succ (C_j, \beta)$$

By the Behaviour-Compact property of well-formedness (Def. 5.1.3), one of the behaviours in the cycle must be recursive, i.e. it must have the form $\mathsf{rec}_{\beta'}\, b'$ for some b' and β'. Let $b_k = \mathsf{rec}_{\beta'}\, b'$; by definition of $\succ$ $b_{k+1} = b'$. Moreover, C_k must contain the constraint $(\mathsf{rec}_{\beta'}\, b' \subseteq \beta')$, whereas C_{k+1} contains the dummy constraint $\tau \subseteq \beta'$ in its place. Because of this, the number of recursive constraints $\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b \subseteq \beta$ decrease by one element in C_{k+1}.

Since C is a finite set, the infinite chain in $\succ$ must contain a constraints set C' such that C' contains no recursive constraints anymore. Since all cycles in behaviours constraints must contain at least a recursive behaviour, and since C' contains no such constraints, then there can be no infinite chain after C'. This contradicts the hypothesis that there is an infinite chain from (C, b), and the lemma is proved.

D.3 Behaviour variables elimination

The occurrence of a variable β in a behaviour b creates an indirect link between b and the constraints C where β is defined. This hidden connections introduces

cumbersome technical complications when proving properties of the abstract interpretation semantics. On the contrary, *ground behaviours*, i.e. behaviours that do not contain β variables, are easier to reason about. This section introduces a translation from any behaviour b to the ground behaviour $[\![b]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C$, and shows that it is fully abstract w.r.t the abstract operational semantics (provided that C is well-defined).

The abstract interpretation semantics treats β variables as place-holders: Rule ICH replaces a β with any behaviour b to which β is bound in C; Rule REC effectively replaces each β variables inside recursive behaviours $\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b$ with τ.

These observations suggest that a β variable can be substituted either with the internal choice of all the behaviour it binds in C, or with a τ inside recursive behaviours. Such a translation is defined as follows:

Definition D.2 (Ground translation). *Let C be a well-formed constraint set. The* ground translation $[\![-]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C :: \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B}$ *is the total function defined by the following equations:*

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
[\![b]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C & = b & \text{if } \beta \sharp b \text{ for any } \beta \\
[\![b_1; b_2]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C & = [\![b_1]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C; [\![b_2]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C & \\
[\![b_1 \oplus b_2]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C & = [\![b_1]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C \oplus [\![b_2]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C & \\
[\![\mathit{spawn}\, b]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C & = \mathit{spawn}\, [\![b]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C & \\
[\![\&_{i\in I}\rho?L_i\,; b_i]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C & = \&_{i\in I}\rho?L_i\,; [\![b_i]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C & \\
[\![\beta]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C & = \bigoplus\{\, [\![b_i]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C \mid b_i \subseteq \beta \in C \,\} & \\
[\![\mathit{rec}_\beta\, b]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_{C \uplus \{b' \subseteq \beta\}} & = \mathit{rec}_\beta\, [\![b]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_{C \cup \{\tau \subseteq \beta\}} &
\end{array}
$$

We now show that, when a constraint set C is well-formed, the ground translation of a behaviour b in C does not expand β variables infinitely, but it constructs a *finite* ground behaviour, i.e. a behaviour with a finite syntax tree:

Lemma D.2. *Let C be well-formed and b be a finite behaviour. For any behaviour b, $[\![b]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C$ is a finite ground term.*

Proof. By well-founded induction on $\succ$.

The base case is when b is a ground term in $\{\tau, \mathsf{push}(l:\eta), \rho!L\ldots\}$. These are all ground terms in G, and for these terms the translation $[\![b]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C = b$, which is finite and ground by hypothesis.

If $b \in \{b_1; b_2, b_1 \oplus b_2, \mathsf{spawn}\, b_1, [\![\&_{i\in I}\rho?L_i\,; b_i]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C\}$, then the lemma is proved by the inductive hypothesis, since for example if $b = b_1; b_2$, then $[\![b_1]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C$ and $[\![b_2]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C$ are finite ground terms, and therefore $[\![b_1]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C; [\![b_2]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C$ is finite and ground too.

Because of well-formedness, there are two cases to consider when $b = \beta$: either β is bound to a unique constraint $b \neq \mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b'$ in C, or it is bound to multiple b_i which are not recursive behaviours. In the case that $b \subseteq \beta$ is the only constraint on β in C, and we can write C ad $C' \uplus \{b \subseteq \beta\}$. By definition of translation we have $[\![\beta]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_C = [\![\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b']\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_{C' \uplus \{b \subseteq \beta\}} = \mathsf{rec}_\beta\, [\![b']\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_{C' \uplus \{b \subseteq \tau\}}$. Since $(C \uplus \{\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b' \subseteq \beta\}, \mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b') \succ (C \cup \{\tau \subseteq \beta\}, b')$ holds by definition of $\succ$, the lemma is proved by inductive hypothesis. In the latter case, when β is bound to multiple non-recursive behaviours b_i, the set of all such b_i is finite by well-formedness, and the lemma is proved by the inductive hypothesis as in the case $b_1; b_2$.

Having proved that the ground translation of a behaviour b always exists for well-formed constraints C, we show some property of the translation w.r.t. the abstract semantics:

Lemma D.3. *Let C be well-formed.*

1. *if $\Delta \vDash b \to_C \Delta \vDash b'$, then $\Delta \vDash [\![b]\!]^{\mathtt{g}}_C \to_C \Delta' \vDash [\![b']\!]^{\mathtt{g}}_C$*
2. *If $\Delta \vDash [\![b]\!]^{\mathtt{g}}_C \to_C \Delta' \vDash b''$, then there exists a b' such that $b'' = [\![b']\!]^{\mathtt{g}}_C$.*

Proof. By rule induction.

The termination of Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ hinges on the finiteness of its input behaviour. Even though the algorithm expands the input constraints set C with additional type and session constraints, the size of a ground term remains constant:

Lemma D.4 (Constraint expansion). *For any well-formed C, if C' does not contain behavior constraints, then $[\![b]\!]^{\mathtt{g}}_C = [\![b]\!]^{\mathtt{g}}_{C \cup C'}$ for any b.*

Proof. By structural induction on b.

D.4 Finite state-space

We conclude this section by showing that, given a well-formed C, all configurations $\Delta \vDash b$ always generate a finite state-space, i.e. the set of reachable states from $\Delta \vDash b$ is finite. We prove this result by designing a function that assigns an integer, or *size*, to any configuration $\Delta \vDash b$, and then show that the size of a configuration always decreases after taking a step in the abstract interpretation semantics. Since configurations of size 0 cannot take steps, and since the size decreases after taking a step in the semantics, the number of states that a finite configuration $\Delta \vDash b$ can reach is finite.

We first introduce the size function on behaviours:

Definition D.3 (Behaviour size). *For any behaviour b, the behaviour size $size(-) :: \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{N}$ is the total function defined by the following equations:*

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
size(\tau) & = 0 & size(\beta) = 0 \\
size(\mathsf{push}(l : \eta)) & = 2 & size(\rho?\rho') = 2 \\
size(\rho!T) & = 1 & size(\rho?T) = 1 \\
size(\rho!\rho') & = 1 & size(\rho!L_i) = 1 \\
size(\underset{i \in I}{\&}\{\rho?L_i\,; b_i\}) & = 1 + \textstyle\sum_{i \in I} size(b_i) & size(\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b) = 1 + size(b) \\
size(b_1; b_2) & = 1 + size(b_1) + size(b_2) & size(\mathsf{spawn}\, b) = 2 + size(b) \\
size(b_1 \oplus b_2) & = 1 + size(b_1) + size(b_2) &
\end{array}
$$

According to the definition, τ is the behaviour with the smallest size, zero. Most operations have size 1, except for the resume operation $\rho?\rho'$, which has size 2. Notice that push has size 2 as well. The reason for this difference is that these operations introduce new frames on the stack in the abstract interpretation

semantics, and therefore have to be counted twice in order for the abstract interpretation semantics to be always decreasing in size. The size of the other behaviours is defined inductively.

We now introduce the size of a stack:

Definition D.4 (Stack size). *The size of a stack Δ, or $size(\Delta)$, is defined by the following equations:*

$$size(\epsilon) = 0 \qquad\qquad size((l : \eta) \cdot \Delta) = 1 + size(\Delta)$$

In short, the size of a stack is its length, or total number of frames. We finally specify the size of configurations:

Definition D.5 (Configuration size). *The size of a configuration $\Delta \vDash b$, or $size(\Delta \vDash b)$, is the sum $size(\Delta \vDash b) = 1 + size(\Delta) + size(b)$.*

An important property of $size(-)$ is that it is invariant to session types:

Lemma D.5 (Session substitution distributivity). *For any session substitution σ, $size(\Delta \vDash b) = size(\Delta\sigma \vDash b\sigma)$.*

Proof. By structural induction on $\Delta \vDash b$.

The size of a configuration decreases strictly after each step in the abstract interpretation semantics. This result provides a useful induction principle to reason about Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$, which will be used to prove a completeness result for $\mathcal{MC}$. The following lemma expresses this result:

Lemma D.6. *Let C be well-formed, and let b be a ground finite behaviour. If $\Delta \vDash b \rightarrow_C \Delta' \vDash b'$, then $size(\Delta \vDash b) > size(\Delta' \vDash b')$.*

Proof. By rule induction.

If Rule End is applied, then $(l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta \vDash b \rightarrow_C \Delta \vDash b$. By definition of size, $size((l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta \vDash b) = size((l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta) + size(b) = 1 + size(\Delta) + size(b) = 1 + size(\Delta \vDash b)$, which proves the lemma.

By hypothesis b is a ground term, therefore Rule Beta cannot be applied.

If Rule Push is applied, then $\Delta \vDash \mathsf{push}(l : \eta) \rightarrow_C (l : \eta) \cdot \Delta \vDash \tau$ holds. By definition, $size(\Delta \vDash \mathsf{push}(l : \eta)) = 2 + size(\Delta) = 1 + size((l : \eta) \cdot \Delta) = 1 + size((l : \eta) \cdot \Delta \vDash \tau)$, which proves the lemma. The case for Rule Res is proved similarly.

If Rule Out is applied, then $(l : !T.\eta) \cdot \Delta \vDash \rho!T' \rightarrow_C (l : \eta) \cdot \Delta \vDash \tau$ holds. By definition, $size((l : !T.\eta) \cdot \Delta \vDash \rho!T') = size((l : !T.\eta) \cdot \Delta) + 1 = 1 + size(\Delta) + 1 = size((l : \eta) \cdot \Delta) + 1 = size((l : \eta) \cdot \Delta \vDash \tau)$, which proves the lemma. The cases for Rule In and Del are proved similarly.

If Rule ICh is applied, then $\Delta \vDash b_1 \oplus b_2 \rightarrow_C \Delta \vDash b_i$ holds for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. By definition of size, then $size(\Delta \vDash b_1 \oplus b_2) = size(\Delta) + 1 + size(b_1) + size(b_2) = 1 + size(\Delta \vDash b_i) + size(b_j)$ for $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$. The lemma is proved by $1 + size(\Delta \vDash b_i) + size(b_j) > size(\Delta \vDash b_i)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. The cases for Rule ECh, Rec, Spn and Tau are proved similarly.

If Rule Seq is applied, then $\Delta \vDash b_1; b_2 \rightarrow_C \Delta' \vDash b_1'; b_2$ only if $\Delta \vDash b_1 \rightarrow_C \Delta' \vDash b_1'$ holds. By rule induction $size(\Delta \vDash b_1) > size(\Delta' \vDash b_1')$. By definition of size, $size(\Delta \vDash b_1; b_2) = 1 + size(\Delta) + size(b_1) + size(b_2)$; by the previous inequality we have that $1 + size(\Delta) + size(b_1) + size(b_2) > 1 + size(\Delta') + size(b_1') + size(b_2) = size(\Delta' \vDash b_1'; b_2)$, which proves the lemma.

D.5 Termination of $\mathcal{MC}$

In order to prove termination, some well-formedness properties of algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ need to be proved first. In particular, we want to show that $\mathcal{MC}$ returns well-formed outputs, given some well-formed arguments as input.

A configuration $\Delta \vDash b$ is well-formed in configuration C when any free variable occurring in $\Delta \vDash b$ is bound by some constraint in C:

Definition D.6 (Variable well-formedness). *A variable γ is* well-formed *in a constraints set C when, if $\gamma \in \{\beta, \rho, \psi, \psi_{\mathsf{in}}, \psi_{\mathsf{ex}}\}$, then there exists a constraint $(g \subseteq \gamma) \in C$ such that all the free variables in g are well-formed in C.*

Definition D.7 (Configuration well-formedness). *A configuration $\Delta \vDash b$ is* well-formed *in a constraint set C when all the free variables in $\Delta \vDash b$ are well-formed in C.*

Given a well-formed constraints set C and a well-formed configuration $\Delta \vDash K[b]$ in C, Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ returns a *session inference substitution* σ and a *refined* constraints set C'.

Following the approach of [1, Sec. 2.2.5, p.51], session inference substitution (or simply session substitution) is a total function from session variables to session types, defined as follows:

Definition D.8 (Session inference substitution). *An* inference substitution *σ is a total function from session variables ψ to sessions η. The* domain *of an inference substitution σ is $dom(\sigma) = \{\, \psi \mid \sigma(\psi) \neq \psi \,\}$ and its range is $rg(\sigma) = \bigcup\{\, FV(\sigma(\psi)) \mid \psi \in dom(\sigma) \,\}$.*

It is easy to verify that Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ only returns session substitutions:

Lemma D.7. *If $\Delta \vDash K[b]$ is well-formed in C and $\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ k,\ C\big) = (\sigma, C')$, then σ is a session inference substitution.*

Proof. By induction on $size(\Delta \vDash K[b])$.

During session type inference, Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ might need to subsume some type T inside an inferred session type to a more general type T'. For example, suppose that $\mathcal{MC}$ has inferred session type $\eta = !T.\mathsf{end}$ (for some T) and a set C for an endpoint l. If the same endpoint is used in the behaviour $b = l!T'$, b respects session type η only if $C \vdash T' <: T$ holds, according to the abstract interpretation semantics of Fig. 4. Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ deals with type subsumption by adding new type constraints in the input set C in the constraints set C'; for

example, it would add the constraint $(T' \subseteq T)$ in the previous example. We say that C' is a *refinement* of C, in the sense C' is a superset of C that further specifies types and session types.

Constraints refinement is defined as follows:

Definition D.9 (Constraints refinement). *A constraint set C is a refinement of constraint set C', or $C \vdash C'$, when:*

- *for all constraints $(\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \eta')$ in C', there exists a session η such that $C \vdash \eta <: \eta'$ and $C \vdash \psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \eta$ hold.*
- *for all constraints $(\psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \eta')$ in C', there exists session η such that $C \vdash \eta <: \eta'$ and $C \vdash \psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \eta$ hold.*
- *if $C' \vdash \mathsf{push}(l : \eta') \subseteq \beta$, then $C \vdash \mathsf{push}(l : \eta) \subseteq \beta$ and $C \vdash \eta <: \eta'$*
- *for all other constraints $(g \subseteq g')$ in C', $C \vdash g \subseteq g'$ holds*

Constraint refinements are unaffected by session substitutions:

Lemma D.8 (Substitution invariance). *Let C and C' be well-formed, and σ a session inference substitution. If $C \vdash C'$, then $C\sigma \vdash C'\sigma$.*

Proof. By induction on the size of C.

Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ progressively refines the input constraints set C by refining session variables ψ, assigning a lower session type to external and internal choices bound to variables ψ_{ex} and ψ_{in}, and by adding type constraints $T \subseteq T'$. When the algorithm terminates, the resulting set C' is a refinement of C, after applying the inferred substitution σ to it.

Lemma D.9 (Constraint refinement on sub-types). *If $\mathsf{sub}(\eta_1, \eta_2, C) = (\sigma_1, C_1)$, then $C_1 \vdash C\sigma_1$.*

Proof. By structural induction on η_1.

Function sub terminates when either η_2 has the same shape as η_1 (i.e. if $\eta_1 = !T_1.\eta_1'$ then $\eta_2 = !T_2.\eta_2'$), or η_2 is a variable ψ_2. In the latter case $(\eta_1, \psi_2, C) = (\sigma, C\sigma)$ with $\sigma = [\psi_2 \mapsto \eta_1]$, and the lemma is trivially proved by $C\sigma \vdash C\sigma$.

Consider the former case, when η_1 and η_2 have the same shape. When $\eta_1 = \mathsf{end}$ the lemma holds trivially. If η_1 is $!T_1.\eta_1'$, then $\eta_2 = !T_2.\eta_2'$; by induction we have $C_1 \vdash C\sigma_1 \cup \{T_2\sigma_1 \subseteq T_1\sigma_1\}$, which implies $C_1 \vdash C\sigma_1$ by definition of constraint refinement. The case for $\eta_1 = ?T_1.\eta_1'$ is proved similarly.

The cases for delegate and resume hold directly by inductive hypothesis.

When η_1 is an internal choice, we need to show that $f(I_2, C) = (\sigma_1, C_1)$ implies $C_1 \vdash C\sigma_1$. This can be easily proved by induction of the size of I_2. The base case (line 21) is trivial. In the inductive case, if a label k from I_2 is missing in I_1 (lines 22-25), then $\oplus\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}_{i \in I_1 \cup \{k\}} \oplus \eta_{2_k}$ is a subtype of $\oplus\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}_{i \in I_1}$ by definition (because $I_1 \cup \{k\} \subset I_1$) and the lemma follows by inductive hypothesis. If k is in I_1, then the lemma follows directly by inductive hypothesis.

When η_1 is an external choice, we need to show that $f(J_1 \cup J_2, C) = (\sigma_1, C_1)$ implies $C_1 \vdash C\sigma_1$. We prove this by induction on the size of $J_1 \cup J_2$. Let $\eta_1 =$

$\&\{L_i : \eta_{1i}\}_{i\in(I_1,I_2)}$ and $\eta_2 = \&\{L_i : \eta_{2i}\}_{i\in(J_1,J_2)}$ be such that $I_1 \subseteq J_1$. The base case (line 36) is trivial. In the inductive case, suppose that a label k is either in the inactive labels J_2, or it is in both the active labels I_1 and J_1. Then it is sufficient to show that η_{1k} is a subtype of η_{2k}, which holds by inductive hypothesis on sub. If k is in the active labels I_1 but it is in the inactive labels J_2, then removing k from I_1 and adding it to the inactive labels I_2 makes $I_1\backslash\{k\}$ be a subset of J_1; under this condition the subsequent call $\mathsf{f}(I \cup \{k\}, C_1)$ is proved as in the previous case. If k is neither in I_1 nor I_2, then k is added to the inactive labels I_2 and the lemma is proved as in the previous case too.

Lemma D.10 (Constraint refinement). *If* $\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash b, C, K) = (\sigma_1, C_1)$, *then* $C_1 \vdash C\sigma_1$.

Proof. By induction on $size(\Delta\sigma \vDash [\![(K[b])\sigma]\!]^{\mathsf{g}}_{C_1})$.

Most cases follow directly from the inductive hypothesis, such as the case for push:

```
11 -- push a new frame on the stack
12 MC(Δ ⊨ push(l : η), C, K) = (σ2σ1, C2)
13   if   (σ1, Δ1) = checkFresh(l, Δ)
14   and (σ2, C2) = MC((l : ησ1) · Δ1 ⊨ τ, Cσ1, Kσ1)
```

At line 14 we have that $\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\eta\sigma_1)\cdot\Delta_1 \vDash \tau,\ C\sigma_1,\ K\sigma_1\big) = (\sigma_2, C_2)$. By inductive hypothesis, we obtain directly $C_2 \vdash C\sigma_2\sigma_1$.

The lemma is also trivial when b is an operation that sends a type T:

```
16 -- send
17 MC((l : ψ) · Δ ⊨ ρ!T, C, K) = (σ2σ1, C2)
18   if   C ⊢ l ∼ ρ
19   and σ1 = [ψ ↦ !α.ψ'] where α, ψ' fresh
20   and (σ2, C2) = MC((l : ψ') · Δσ1 ⊨ τ, Cσ1 ∪ {T ⊆ α}, Kσ1)
```

At line 20 we have $\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi')\cdot\Delta\sigma_1 \vDash \tau,\ C\sigma_1 \cup \{T \subseteq \alpha\},\ K\sigma_1\big) = (\sigma_2, C_2)$. By inductive hypothesis we obtain directly that $C_2 \vdash C\sigma_2\sigma_1 \cup \{T\sigma_2 \subseteq \alpha\sigma_2\}$, which in turn implies $C_2 \vdash C\sigma_2\sigma_1$ by definition of constraints refinement; this proves the lemma. The lemma is proved similarly when a type T is received (lines 25-32), and when a session is resumed (lines 50-61). When the behaviour delegates a session (lines 34-48), the lemma is proved by Lem. D.9.

The case is more interesting when the behaviour b extends an inferred internal choice with a new label:

```
73 MC((l : ψin) · Δ ⊨ ρ!Li, C, K) = MC((l : ψi) · Δ ⊨ τ, C' ⊎ {ψin ∼ ⊕_{j∈J,i}{Lj : ηj}}, K)
74   if   C ⊢ l ∼ ρ
75   and i ∉ J and C = C' ⊎ {ψin ∼ ⊕_{j∈J}{Lj : ηj}} and ηi = ψi fresh
```

By definition of $\mathcal{MC}$ at lines 73 and 75, we have:

$$C = C' \uplus \{\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \eta_1\} \qquad \eta_1 = \oplus_{j\in J}\{L_j : \eta_j\}$$

$$C_1 = C' \uplus \{\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \eta_1'\} \qquad \eta_1' = \oplus_{j\in J,i}\{L_j : \eta_j\}$$

where $i \notin J$. Notice that $\eta_1' <: \eta_1$ holds by definition of subtyping, since $J \subseteq J \cup \{i\}$. By Def. D.9 of constraint refinement, $C_1 \vdash C$ holds too, because C' is contained in C verbatim, and we have just proved that $\eta_1' <: \eta_1$.

By the inductive hypothesis, if $\mathcal{MC}$ terminates with (σ_2, C_2), then $C_2 \vdash C_1\sigma_2$ holds. By Lem. D.8, the previous result $C_1 \vdash C$ implies $C_1\sigma_2 \vdash C\sigma_2$. By transitivity of constraint refinement, we have $C_2 \vdash C\sigma_2$ and the lemma is proved.

Let now b be an external choice, with $b = \&_{i \in I} \rho?L_i\,;b_i$. For ease of exposition, let us first consider the case where the $\mathcal{MC}$ clause at line 89 applies:

89 $\mathcal{MC}\big((l : \psi_{\mathsf{ex}}) \cdot \Delta \vDash \underset{i \in I}{\&} \rho?L_i\,;b_i,\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_n \ldots \sigma_0, C_n)$
90 if $C \vdash l \sim \rho$ and $J_1 \subseteq I$ and $I \subseteq J_1 \uplus J_2$
91 and $C = C' \uplus \{\psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \underset{j \in (J_1, J_2)}{\&}\{L_j : \eta_j\}\}$
92 and for each $k \in [1 \ldots n]$ where $I = \{L_{j_1}, \ldots, L_{j_n}\}$ and $n \geq 0$
93 $(\sigma_k, C_k) = \mathcal{MC}\big(((l : \eta_{j_k}) \cdot \Delta \vDash b_{j_k})\sigma_{k-1} \ldots \sigma_0,\ C_{k-1},\ K\sigma_{k-1} \ldots \sigma_0\big)$
94 where $\sigma_0 = \sigma_{id}$ and $C_0 = C$

In this case, the final constraints set C_n is obtained by recursively refining the input C through invocations to $\mathcal{MC}$ at line 93. By inductive hypothesis, we have that each set $C_1, C_2, \ldots C_n$ is a successive refinement of C, i.e. $C_n \vdash C_{n-1}\sigma_n, \ldots, C_1 \vdash C_0\sigma_0$ hold. Since $C_0 = C$, the last refinement can be written as $C_1 \vdash C\sigma_0$. By Lem. D.8 this implies $C_1\sigma_1 \vdash C\sigma_1\sigma_0$. Since $C_2 \vdash C_1\sigma_1$ holds by inductive hypothesis, it also follows that $C_2 \vdash C\sigma_1\sigma_0$ by transitivity of constraint refinement. By repeating this reasoning, we can conclude by transitivity of constraint refinement that $C_k \vdash C\sigma_k \ldots \sigma_0$ for any $k \leq |I|$. Since a well-formed behaviour is finite and b is well-formed by assumption, the external choice in b has a finite set of labels L_i for $i \in I$. Therefore I is a finite set, and we can conclude that $C_n \vdash C\sigma_n \ldots \sigma_0$ for $n = |I|$, which proves the lemma.

Suppose that either the clause at line 78 or line 84 applies. Notice that in these two cases we cannot apply the inductive hypothesis directly, since $\mathcal{MC}$ is passed the entire behaviour b as input. However, the only clause of $\mathcal{MC}$ that applies is the third clause at line 89. In the first case (line 78) the algorithm creates a new external choice constraint in C, by associating the session $\&\{L_i : \psi_i\}_{i \in (I, \emptyset)}$ to a fresh session variable ψ_{ex}. The first $\mathcal{MC}$ clause cannot be called again, because the stack contains ψ_{ex} in place of ψ (line 82). Notice that the set of inactive labels is the empty set, therefore the second $\mathcal{MC}$ clause does not apply, since $I = I_1$ in this case and therefore $I_3 = \emptyset$. Therefore the only $\mathcal{MC}$ clause that applies is the the third one, and the lemma is proved as in the first case. By a similar reasoning, the only clause that applies to the sub-call to $\mathcal{MC}$ in the first clause (line 87) is the third clause, and the lemma is proved similarly.

Before proving termination of $\mathcal{MC}$, we prove some further properties of the auxiliary functions from Sec. C.3, which $\mathcal{MC}$ uses.

Lemma D.11 (finalize). *For any well-formed stack Δ,* finalize Δ *terminates.*

Proof. By structural induction on Δ. If $\Delta = \epsilon$, then finalize ϵ terminates with the empty substitution (line 12). If $\Delta = (l : \eta) \cdot \Delta'$, then the lemma follows by

inductive hypothesis when $\eta = \mathsf{end}$ or $\eta = \psi$ (lines 13 and 14), or it terminates with an error otherwise, since no other finalize clause applies.

Lemma D.12 (checkFresh). *For any well-formed stack Δ and label l, the function call* $\mathsf{checkFresh}(l, \Delta)$ *terminates. Moreover, if l occurs in Δ and the function call* $\mathsf{checkFresh}(l, \Delta) = (\sigma, \Delta')$*, then $size(\Delta') < size(\Delta)$; otherwise $size(\Delta') \leq size(\Delta)$.*

Proof. By structural induction on Δ. The base case is $\Delta = \epsilon$, whereby checkFresh terminates with (σ_{id}, ϵ) (line 2), and the second part of the lemma is vacuously true, since l cannot occur in the empty stack ϵ. In the inductive case when $\Delta = (l' : \eta) \cdot \Delta'$, checkFresh terminates immediately with a smaller stack if $l = l'$ and either $\eta = \mathsf{end}$ (line 3) or $\eta = \psi$ (line 4). If $l \neq l'$, then checkFresh terminates with a smaller stack by inductive hypothesis. Otherwise it terminates with an error (because no other clauses apply) and the second condition of the lemma is vacuously true.

Corollary D.1 (closeTop). *For any well-formed stack Δ,* closeTop Δ *terminates. Moreover, if* $\mathsf{closeTop}\ \Delta = (\sigma, \Delta')$*, then $size(\Delta') < size(\Delta)$.*

Proof. By Lem. D.12.

Lemma D.13 (sub). *For any session η_1, η_2 and well-formed C,* $\mathsf{sub}(\eta_1, \eta_2, C)$ *terminates.*

Proof. By structural induction on η_1 and η_2.

We can now prove termination of $\mathcal{MC}$:

Proposition D.1 (Termination of $\mathcal{MC}$). *For any well-formed C and $\Delta \vDash K[b]$, $\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ K,\ C\big)$ terminates.*

Proof. By lexicographic induction on $size(\Delta \vDash [\![K[b]]\!]^{\mathsf{g}}_C)$ and $size([\![b]\!]^{\mathsf{g}}_C)$. We proceed by case analysis on the $\mathcal{MC}$ clauses in Sec. C.2.

– **Ended session**:

```
1 -- remove terminated frames
2 MC((l : end) · Δ ⊨ b, C, K) = MC(Δ ⊨ b, C, K)
```

This case follows by inductive hypothesis, since $size(\Delta) < size((l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta)$ by Def. D.4.

– **Tau**:

```
4 -- MC terminates with behavior τ
5 MC(Δ ⊨ τ, C, ϵ) = (σ, Cσ)
6   if σ = finalize Δ
```

By Lem. D.11, finalize terminates for any Δ, therefore algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ always terminates and the proposition is proved.

– **Tau sequence**:

$$\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash \tau,\ C,\ b \cdot K) = \mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash b,\ C,\ K)$$

By definition of continuation stack, $b \cdot K[\tau] = K[\tau; b]$. By Definition D.3 of behaviour size, $size(K[\tau; b]) = 1 + size(K[b])$. Therefore the configuration $\Delta \vDash (b \cdot K)[\tau]$ has greater size than configuration $\Delta \vDash K[b]$, and the proposition follows by inductive hypothesis.

– **New session push**:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash \mathsf{push}(l : \eta),\ C,\ K) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2) \\
&\quad \text{if} \quad (\sigma_1, \Delta_1) = \mathsf{checkFresh}(l, \Delta) \\
&\quad \text{and } (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}((l : \eta\sigma_1) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \tau,\ C\sigma_1,\ K\sigma_1)
\end{aligned}$$

By Lem. D.12, $\mathsf{checkFresh}(l, \Delta)$ always terminates, and if it terminates successfully then Δ_1 has smaller or equal size to Δ. By Definition D.5 of configuration size and by Lem. D.5:

$$\begin{aligned}
size(\Delta \vDash K[\mathsf{push}(l : \eta)]) &= 1 + 2 + size(\Delta) + size(K[\tau]) \\
&\geq 1 + 2 + size(\Delta_1) + size(K\sigma_1[\tau]) \\
&= 1 + 1 + size((l : \eta\sigma_1) \cdot \Delta_1) + size(K\sigma_1[\tau]) \\
&> 1 + size((l : \eta\sigma_1) \cdot \Delta_1) + size(K\sigma_1[\tau]) \\
&= size((l : \eta\sigma_1) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash K\sigma_1[\tau])
\end{aligned}$$

and the proposition is proved by the inductive hypothesis. Recall that, by definition of size, $1 + size(\Delta) = size((l : \eta) \cdot \Delta)$ for any η and l, since $size(-)$ is invariant to session types.

– **Value send**:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{MC}((l : \psi) \cdot \Delta \vDash \rho!T,\ C,\ K) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2) \\
&\quad \text{if} \quad C \vdash l \sim \rho \\
&\quad \text{and } \sigma_1 = [\psi \mapsto\ !\alpha.\psi'] \text{ where } \alpha, \psi' \text{ fresh} \\
&\quad \text{and } (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}((l : \psi') \cdot \Delta\sigma_1 \vDash \tau,\ C\sigma_1 \cup \{T \subseteq \alpha\},\ K\sigma_1) \\
&\\
&\mathcal{MC}((l : !\alpha.\eta) \cdot \Delta \vDash \rho!T,\ C,\ K) = \mathcal{MC}((l : \eta) \cdot \Delta \vDash \tau,\ C \cup \{T \subseteq \alpha\},\ K) \\
&\quad \text{if} \quad C \vdash l \sim \rho
\end{aligned}$$

By the inductive hypothesis in both cases. The other cases when b is $\rho!T$, $\rho?T$, $\rho!L_k$, $\rho?L_k$, $\rho!\rho_d$ and $\rho?l_d$ are all proved similarly.

– **Session delegation**:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{MC}((l : !\eta_d.\eta) \cdot (l_d : \eta'_d) \cdot \Delta \vDash \rho!\rho_d,\ C,\ K) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2) \\
&\quad \text{if} \quad C \vdash l \sim \rho \text{ and } C \vdash l_d \sim \rho_d \\
&\quad \text{and } (\sigma_1, C_1) = \mathsf{sub}(\eta'_d, \eta_d, C)
\end{aligned}$$

40 and $(\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}\big((l:\eta)\cdot\Delta\sigma \vDash \tau,\ C_1,\ K\sigma_1\big)$

41

42 $\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\eta)\cdot(l_d:\eta'_d)\cdot\Delta \vDash \rho!\rho_d,\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$
43 if $C \vdash l_d \not\sim \rho_d$
44 and $(\sigma_1, \Delta_1) = \mathsf{checkFresh}(l_d, (l:\eta)\cdot(l_d:\eta'_d)\cdot\Delta)$
45 and $(\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta_1 \vDash \rho!\rho_d,\ C\sigma_1,\ K\sigma_1\big)$

By Lem. D.13 and inductive hypothesis in the first clause, and by D.12 and inductive hypothesis in the second clause.

– **External choice**:

77 *-- ex. choice*
78 $\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi)\cdot\Delta \vDash \&_{i\in I}\{\rho?L_i\,;b_i\},\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$
79 if $C \vdash l \sim \rho$
80 and $\sigma_1 = [\psi \mapsto \psi_{\mathsf{ex}}]$ where ψ_{ex} fresh
81 and $C_1 = \{\psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \&\{L_i : \psi_i\}_{i\in(I,\emptyset)}\}$ where $\overrightarrow{\psi_i}$ fresh
82 and $(\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi_{\mathsf{ex}})\cdot\Delta\sigma_1 \vDash \big(\&_{i\in I}\{\rho?L_i\,;b_i\}\big)\sigma_1,\ C\sigma_1 \cup C_1,\ K\sigma_1\big)$

83

84 $\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi_{\mathsf{ex}})\cdot\Delta \vDash \&_{j\in I_1\uplus I_2\uplus I_3}\rho?L_j\,;b_j,\ C,\ K\big) = \mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi_{\mathsf{ex}})\cdot\Delta \vDash \&_{j\in I_1\uplus I_2\uplus I_3}\rho?L_j\,;b_j,\ C_1,\ K\big)$
85 if $C \vdash l \sim \rho$
86 and $C = C' \uplus \{\psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \&\{L_j : \eta_j\}_{j\in(I_1J_1, I_2J_2)}\}$ and $I_3 \sharp J_1 \uplus J_2$ and $I_3, J_1 \neq \emptyset$
87 and $C_1 = C' \cup \{\psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \&\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i\in(I_1,I_2I_3J_1J_2)}\}$

88

89 $\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi_{\mathsf{ex}})\cdot\Delta \vDash \&_{i\in I}\rho?L_i\,;b_i,\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_n\ldots\sigma_0, C_n)$
90 if $C \vdash l \sim \rho$ and $J_1 \subseteq I$ and $I \subseteq J_1 \uplus J_2$
91 and $C = C' \uplus \{\psi_{\mathsf{ex}} \sim \&\{L_j : \eta_j\}_{j\in(J_1,J_2)}\}$
92 and for each $k \in [1\ldots n]$ where $I = \{L_{j_1}, \ldots, L_{j_n}\}$ and $n \geq 0$
93 $(\sigma_k, C_k) = \mathcal{MC}\big(((l:\eta_{j_k})\cdot\Delta \vDash b_{j_k})\sigma_{k-1}\ldots\sigma_0,\ C_{k-1},\ K\sigma_{k-1}\ldots\sigma_0\big)$
94 where $\sigma_0 = \sigma_{id}$ and $C_0 = C$

As shown in the proof of Lem. D.10, the first two clauses recursively call $\mathcal{MC}$ with the same input, except for an expanded ψ and C_1 in the first case (line 78), and a modified ψ_{ex} in the second case (line 84). Let us therefore analyse the third clause first.
Let $b = \&_{i\in I}\rho?L_i\,;b_i$. If the third clause is applied (line 89), the proposition is a straightforward consequence of the inductive hypothesis and Lem. D.5, since each recursive invocation of $\mathcal{MC}$ has as input b_{j_k}, which is a sub-behaviour of the input behaviour b.
If the first clause is invoked (line 78), by Lem. D.10 and Lem. D.4 we have $size([\![\Delta \vDash b]\!]^{\mathsf{g}}_C) = size([\![\Delta\sigma_1 \vDash b\sigma_1]\!]^{\mathsf{g}}_{C\sigma_1\cup C_1})$. Since the size of the behaviour is the same and the only applicable $\mathcal{MC}$ clause is the third one, the proposition is proved as before.
If the second clause is invoked (line 84), the proof proceeds as in the previous case, except for the fact that the constraint set C is refined instead of

expanded.

– **Behavior sequence**:

96 $-\!-$ *sequencing*
97 $\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash b_1\,;b_2,\ C,\ K) = \mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash b_1,\ C,\ b_2 \cdot K)$

By definition of stack continuation, $K[b_1;b_2] = b_2 \cdot K[b_1]$, and therefore $size(\Delta \vDash K[b_1;b_2]) = size(\Delta \vDash b_2 \cdot K[b_1])$. Because of this, and since $size(b_1) < size(b_1;b_2)$ for any b_2, the proposition is proved by the second ordering in the lexicographic order of the inductive hypothesis.

– **Behavior choice**:

99 $-\!-$ *internal choice in the behavior*
100 $\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash b_1 \oplus b_2,\ C,\ K) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$
101 if $(\sigma_1, C_1) = \mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash b_1,\ C,\ K)$
102 and $(\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}(\Delta\sigma_1 \vDash b_2\sigma_1,\ C_1,\ K\sigma_1)$

By inductive hypothesis.

– **Recursive behavior**:

109 $-\!-$ *rec*
110 $\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash \mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b,\ C) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$
111 if $C = C' \uplus \{b' \subseteq \beta\}$
112 and $(\sigma_1, C_1) = \mathcal{MC}(\epsilon \vDash b,\ C' \cup \{\tau \subseteq \beta\},\ \epsilon)$
113 and $(\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}(\Delta\sigma_1 \vDash \tau,\ (C_1 \backslash \{\tau \subseteq \beta\}) \cup (\{b' \subseteq \beta\})\sigma_1,\ K\sigma_1)$

By inductive hypothesis. By definition of ground term, $[\![\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_{C \uplus \{b' \subseteq \beta\}} = \mathsf{rec}_\beta\, [\![b]\!]^{\mathbf{g}}_{C \cup \{\tau \subseteq \beta\}}$ holds, and therefore the inductive hypothesis can be applied on the first inner call to $\mathcal{MC}$ at line 112. The second call to $\mathcal{MC}$ terminates by the inductive hypothesis as well, since the size of τ is strictly less than the size of a recursive term $\mathsf{rec}_\beta\, b$.

– **Behavior variables**:

115 $-\!-$ *behavior variable*
116 $\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash \beta,\ C,\ K) = \mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash b,\ C,\ K)$
117 where $b = \bigoplus\{b_i \mid \exists i.\ (b_i \subseteq \beta) \in C\}$

This case is proved as for the case of behavior choice, after unrolling the definition of $\mathcal{MC}$.

– **Forced session termination**:

119 $-\!-$ *try to close the top session if all previous clauses fail*
120 $\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash b,\ C,\ K) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2)$
121 if $(\sigma_1, \Delta_1) = \mathsf{closeTop}(\Delta)$
122 and $(\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}(\Delta_1 \vDash b\sigma_1,\ C\sigma_1,\ K\sigma_1)$

By Cor. D.1 and inductive hypothesis.

Termination of $\mathcal{SI}$ follows directly from this result:

Theorem D.1 (Termination of $\mathcal{SI}$). *For any well-formed C and b, $\mathcal{SI}(b, C)$ terminates.*

Proof. By Prop. D.1.

E Soundness of Algorithm $\mathcal{SI}$

This section shows a soundness result for Algorithm $\mathcal{SI}$. Namely we show that, given a well-formed b and C, if $\mathcal{SI}$ terminates with a solution (σ_1, C_1), then the configuration $\epsilon \vDash b\sigma_1$ is strongly normalizing under C_1.

The core of the proof revolves around proving that $\mathcal{MC}$ is sound. However some extra technical machinery is required before proceeding with the proof, because of two issues: the lazy detection of terminated sessions and constraint refinement.

The first issue is that Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ detects the termination of sessions lazily. During inference, open session variables ψ in the stack are assigned the session end only when no other $\mathcal{MC}$ clause is applicable (line 120), or at the very end of session inference at line 5, when the stack is empty and the behaviour is τ.

Because of this laziness, the proof of soundness of $\mathcal{MC}$ requires some flexibility to deal with terminated sessions. We therefore introduce the following equivalence relation on stacks with terminated sessions:

Definition E.1 (Terminated session equivalence).

$$\frac{}{\epsilon \equiv \epsilon} \qquad \frac{\Delta \equiv \Delta'}{(l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta \equiv \Delta'} \qquad \frac{\Delta \equiv \Delta'}{(l : \eta) \cdot \Delta \equiv (l : \eta) \cdot \Delta'} \; \eta \neq \mathsf{end}$$

The second issue is that constraints in C may be refined from time to time in Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$, and we need to show that strong normalization is preserved under constraint refinement. For example, let the stack contain a variable ψ_{in}, and let C contain the constraint $\{\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \subseteq \oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in I}\}$. During session inference the internal choice $\oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in I}$ might be expanded, for example by adding a new label L_k. In such a case the constraint $\{\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \subseteq \oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in I}\}$ is refined to $\{\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \subseteq \oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in I,k}\}$, and C is updated to some C' accordingly. If a behaviour b is strongly normalizing under C, it is now unclear if b is also strongly normalizing in C'.

To address this issue, we introduce the following form of stack sub-typing:

Definition E.2 (Stack sub-typing). *Let C be well-formed. A stack Δ_1 is a subtype of stack Δ_2, or $C \vdash \Delta_1 <: \Delta_2$, when the following relations are satisfied:*

$$C \vdash \epsilon <: \epsilon$$
$$C \vdash (l : \eta_1) \cdot \Delta_1 <: (l : \eta_2) \cdot \Delta_2 \qquad \text{if } C \vdash \eta_1 <: \eta_2 \text{ and } C \vdash \Delta_1 <: \Delta_2$$

The following theorem is crucial in proving that that strong normalization is preserved under constraint refinement:

Theorem E.1 (Liskov's substitution principle). *Let $C_2 \vdash C_1\sigma$, $C_2 \vdash \Delta_2 <: \Delta_1\sigma$. If $\Delta_1 \vDash b \to_{C_1} \Delta_1' \vDash b'$, then $\Delta_2 \vDash b\sigma \to_{C_2} \Delta_2' \vDash b'\sigma_1$ and $C_2 \vdash \Delta_2' <: \Delta_1'\sigma$.*

Proof. By rule induction. The proof of 3 is a trivial consequence of the hypothesis $C_2 \vdash \mathit{pure}(\Delta_2)$, since the continuation of a pure session is itself pure. We only prove 1 and 2:

Case End**:** Suppose that $(l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash b \rightarrow_{C_1} \Delta_1 \vDash b$. By definition of substitution $((l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta_1)\sigma = (l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta_1\sigma$; by definition of stack sub-typing the hypothesis $C_2 \vdash \Delta_2 <: ((l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta_1)\sigma$ implies that $\Delta_2 = (l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta_2'$ for some Δ_2' such that $C_2 \vdash \Delta_2' <: \Delta_1\sigma$. Rule End yields $\Delta_2 \vDash b\sigma \rightarrow_{C_2} \Delta_2' \vDash b\sigma$, which proves the proposition together with $C_2 \vdash \Delta_2' <: \Delta_1\sigma$

Case Beta**:** Let $\Delta_1 \vDash \beta \rightarrow_{C_1} \Delta_1 \vDash b$, assuming that $b \vdash \beta \subseteq C_1$. By definition of refinement, $C_2 \vdash C_1\sigma$ implies that $C_2 \vdash b\sigma \subseteq \beta\sigma$. Since $\beta\sigma = \beta$ by definition of inference substitution, $C_2 \vdash b\sigma \subseteq \beta$ holds, and therefore the proposition is proved by applying Rule Beta on $\Delta_2 \vDash \beta$.

Case Plus**:** Let $\Delta_1 \vDash b_1 \oplus b_2 \rightarrow_{C_1} \Delta_1 \vDash b_i$ with $i \in \{1, 2\}$. By definition of substitution $(b_1 \oplus b_2)\sigma = b_1\sigma \oplus b_2\sigma$. The proposition is proved by straightforward application of Rule Plus, which yields $\Delta_2 \vDash b_1\sigma \oplus b_2\sigma \rightarrow_{C_2} \Delta_2 \vDash b_i\sigma$.

Case Push**:** Let $\Delta_1 \vDash \mathsf{push}(l{:}\eta) \rightarrow_{C_1} (l : \eta) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \tau$ with $l \sharp \Delta$. By application of Rule Push, $\Delta_2 \vDash \mathsf{push}(l : \eta)\sigma \rightarrow_{C_2} (l : \eta\sigma) \cdot \Delta_2 \vDash \tau$ holds because $\mathsf{push}(l : \eta)\sigma = \mathsf{push}(l : \eta\sigma)$. By definition of subtyping $C_2 \vdash \eta\sigma <: \eta\sigma$ holds by reflexivity, and therefore $C_2 \vdash (l : \eta\sigma) \cdot \Delta_2 <: (l : \eta\sigma) \cdot \Delta_1\sigma$ holds, because $C_2 \vdash \Delta_2 <: \Delta_1\sigma$ holds by hypothesis; therefore the proposition is proved.

Case Out**:** Let $(l : !T.\eta) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash l!T_0 \rightarrow_{C_1} (l : \eta) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \tau$, with $C_1 \vdash \mathit{pure}(T_0)$ and $C_1 \vdash T_0 <: T$. By definition of substitution $((l : !T.\eta) \cdot \Delta_1)\sigma = (l : !T\sigma.\eta\sigma) \cdot \Delta_1\sigma$ holds. By definition of stack sub-typing, $C_2 \vdash \Delta_2 <: (l : !T\sigma.\eta\sigma) \cdot \Delta_1\sigma$ implies that $\Delta_2 = (l : !T'.\eta') \cdot \Delta_2'$ such that $C_2 \vdash T\sigma <: T'$ and $C_2 \vdash \Delta_2' <: \Delta_1\sigma$.

Since $C_2 \vdash C_1\sigma$ holds by hypothesis, then $C_1 \vdash T_0 <: T$ implies $C_2 \vdash T_0\sigma <: T\sigma$. By transitivity $C_2 \vdash T_0\sigma <: T\sigma$ and $C_2 \vdash T\sigma <: T'$ imply $C_2 \vdash T_0 <: T'$. Since $l!T_0\sigma = l!(T_0\sigma)$, an application Rule Out yields $(l : !T'.\eta') \cdot \Delta_2' \vDash l!T_0\sigma \rightarrow_{C_2} (l : \eta') \cdot \Delta_2' \vDash \tau$, which proves 1. By definition of session sub-typing, the hypothesis $C_2 \vdash (l : !T'.\eta') \cdot \Delta_2' <: (l : !T\sigma.\eta\sigma) \cdot \Delta_1\sigma$ implies $\eta' \vdash \eta\sigma <: C_2$. We have already proved that $C_2 \vdash \Delta_2' <: \Delta_1\sigma$ holds, therefore we can infer $C_2 \vdash (l : \eta') \cdot \Delta_2' <: (l : \eta\sigma) \cdot \Delta_1\sigma$, which proves 2.

Cases In, Del, Res**:** proved as in case Out, using the fact that sub-typing is covariant for In, Res, and it is contravariant for Del.

Case ICh**:** Let $(l : \oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in I}) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash l!L_k \rightarrow_{C_1} (l : \eta_k) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \tau$ with $k \in I$. By definition of internal choice variables, configuration $(l : \oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in I}) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \rho!L_k$ is equivalent to $(l : \psi_{\mathsf{in}}) \cdot \Delta_1 \vDash \rho!L_k$ with $C_1 \vdash \psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in I}$ for some ψ_{in}. Since $C_2 \vdash C_1\sigma$ holds by hypothesis, by definition of constraint refinement there exists a session $\eta' = \oplus\{L_j : \eta_j'\}_{j \in J}$ such that $C_2 \vdash \psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \eta'$ and $C_2 \vdash \oplus\{L_j : \eta_j'\}_{j \in J} <: \oplus\{L_i : \eta\sigma_i\}_{i \in I}$ hold, with $J \subseteq I$.

Since $J \subseteq I$, $k \in I$ implies $k \in J$; and since $(\rho!L_k)\sigma = \rho!L_k$, an application of Rule ICh yields $(l : \oplus\{L_j : \eta_j'\}_{j \in J}) \cdot \Delta_2' \vDash (\rho!L_k)\sigma \rightarrow_{C_2} (l : \eta_k') \cdot \Delta_2' \vDash \tau$, which proves 1. By definition of session sub-typing $C_2 \vdash \oplus\{L_j : \eta_j'\}_{j \in J} <: \oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in I}$ implies $C_2 \vdash \eta_k' <: \eta_k$; since $C_2 \vdash \Delta_2' <: \Delta_1\sigma$ holds by hypothesis, then $C_2 \vdash (l : \eta_k') \cdot \Delta_2' <: \Delta_1\sigma$ holds too, which proves 2.

Case ECh**:** similar to the case for ICh.

Before proving soundness, we also need a lemma about the session sub-type inference. The sub function infers whether a session η_1 is a sub-type of session η_2:

Lemma E.1 (Soundness of sub). *If* $\mathsf{sub}(\eta_1, \eta_2, C) = (\sigma_1, C_1)$*, then* $C_1 \vdash \eta_1\sigma_1 <: \eta_2\sigma_1$.

Proof. By structural induction on η_1. The structure of the proof is similar to the structure of the proof for Lem. D.9.

The lemma is trivial when $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = \mathsf{end}$. When $\eta_1 = !T_1.\eta_1'$ and $\eta_2 = !T_2.\eta_2'$, C is expanded with the constraint $\{T_2 \subseteq T_1\}$. By structural induction η_1' is a subtype of η_2'; since C_1 contains the constraint $\{T_2 \subseteq T_1\}$, η_1 is a subtype of η_2 by definition of subtyping. The case for receive is similar; the cases for delegation and resume follow straightforwardly by structural induction.

When η_1 is an internal choice variable ψ_{in}, function sub calls an internal function f which inspects each label L_i in η_2, and either expands η_1 if η_1 does not contain L_i, or it just recursively invokes sub on each common branch of the internal choices of η_1 and η_2. The lemma is proved straightforwardly by the definition of session sub-typing in the former case, and by the inductive hypothesis in the latter case.

The proof is similar when η_1 is an external choice variable ψ_{ex}.

When η_1 is a session variable ψ, sub produces the substitution substitutes $[\psi \mapsto \eta_2]$, and the lemma is proved straightforwardly by reflexivity. Similarly when $\eta_2 = \psi$ holds.

Soundness of session inference depends on the following central result:

Proposition E.1 (Soundness of Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$). *Let C be well-formed in $\Delta \vDash b$. If $\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash b, C, K) = (\sigma_1, C_1)$, then there exists Δ' such that $\Delta\sigma_1 \equiv \Delta'$ and $\Delta' \vDash K[b]\sigma_1 \Downarrow_{C_1}$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Prop. D.1, the proposition is proved by lexicographic induction on $size(\Delta \vDash [\![K[b]]\!]^{\mathsf{g}}_C)$ and $size([\![b]\!]^{\mathsf{g}}_C)$.

Let us proceed by case analysis on $\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash b, C)$.

```
-- remove terminated frames
MC((l : end) · Δ ⊨ b, C, K) = MC(Δ ⊨ b, C, K)
```

Suppose that $\mathcal{MC}\big((l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta \vDash b,\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_1, C_1)$. By the inductive hypothesis on the clause $\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ C,\ K\big)$, there exists Δ' such that $\Delta\sigma_1 \equiv \Delta'$ and $\Delta' \vDash K[b]\sigma_1 \Downarrow_{C_1}$. By Def. E.1 of stack equivalence, we have $(l : \eta) \cdot \Delta\sigma_1 \equiv \Delta\sigma_1$. Since $\Delta\sigma_1 \equiv \Delta'$ holds by inductive hypothesis, it follows that $((l : \eta) \cdot \Delta)\sigma_1 \equiv \Delta'$. Therefore the proposition is proved by Δ'.

```
-- MC terminates with behavior τ
MC(Δ ⊨ τ, C, ϵ) = (σ, Cσ)
  if σ = finalize Δ
```

By definition of finalize, a $\Delta\sigma$ is equivalent to the empty stack ϵ, since finalize succeeds only if it replaces all variables ψ in Δ with end, and only end sessions are left in it. The lemma is therefore proved by taking $\Delta' = \epsilon$, because $\epsilon \vDash \tau\sigma \Downarrow_C$ holds trivially for any σ and C.

$$\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash \tau,\ C,\ b \cdot K\big) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ C,\ K\big) \quad \textit{-- pop a sub-behavior from the continuation stack}$$

By inductive hypothesis.

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash \mathsf{push}(l:\eta),\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2) \quad \textit{-- push a new frame on the stack}\\ &\quad \text{if} \quad (\sigma_1, \Delta_1) = \mathsf{checkFresh}(l, \Delta)\\ &\quad \text{and } (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}\big((l:\eta\sigma_1)\cdot\Delta_1 \vDash \tau,\ C\sigma_1,\ K\sigma_1\big)\end{aligned}$$

If this clause succeeds, then also the inner calls to checkFresh does, which implies $\Delta\sigma_1 \equiv \Delta_1$. Notice that Δ_1 contain no frame of the form $(l : \eta)$ for any η, i.e. $l \sharp \Delta_1$. Because of this and by taking $\Delta' = \Delta_1$, the abstract interpretation semantics allows the following transition:

$$\Delta' \vDash K[\mathsf{push}(l:\eta)] \rightarrow_{C_2} (l:\eta)\cdot\Delta' \vDash K[\tau]$$

Since the inner call $\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\eta\sigma_1)\cdot\Delta_1 \vDash \tau,\ C\sigma_1,\ K\sigma_1\big)$ succeeds too, the lemma follows by inductive hypothesis.

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi)\cdot\Delta \vDash \rho!T,\ C,\ K\big) = (\sigma_2\sigma_1, C_2) \quad \textit{-- send}\\ &\quad \text{if} \quad C \vdash l \sim \rho\\ &\quad \text{and } \sigma_1 = [\psi \mapsto\ !\alpha.\psi'] \text{ where } \alpha, \psi' \text{ fresh}\\ &\quad \text{and } (\sigma_2, C_2) = \mathcal{MC}\big((l:\psi')\cdot\Delta\sigma_1 \vDash \tau,\ C\sigma_1 \cup \{T \subseteq \alpha\},\ K\sigma_1\big)\end{aligned}$$

Let us assume that the above clause has been used. Because the domain of inference substitutions is session variables ψ, in this case we have:

$$\big((l:\psi)\cdot\Delta\big)\sigma_2\sigma_1 \vDash K[\rho!T]\sigma_2\sigma_1 = (l:!\alpha.(\psi'\sigma_2))\cdot\Delta\sigma_2\sigma_1 \vDash (K\sigma_2\sigma_1)[\rho!T]$$

From the algorithm we have that $C \vdash l \sim \rho$ holds. The inner call to $\mathcal{MC}$ has $C_1 = C\sigma_1 \cup \{T \subseteq \alpha\}$ as input constraints set. By Lem. D.10, $C_2 \vdash C_1\sigma_2$, and therefore $C_2 \vdash l \sim \rho$ and $C_2 \vdash (T \subseteq \alpha)\sigma_2$ hold. The latter implies $C_2 \vdash T \subseteq \alpha$ because σ_2 is an inference substitution (and therefore any type variable α' in T is fresh from the domain of σ_2). Since $C_2 \vdash l \sim \rho$ and $C_2 \vdash T \subseteq \alpha$ both hold, the abstract interpretation semantics allows the following transition:

$$(l:!\alpha.(\psi'\sigma_2))\cdot\Delta\sigma_2\sigma_1 \vDash (K\sigma_2\sigma_1)\rho!T \rightarrow_{C_2} (l:\psi'\sigma_2)\cdot\Delta\sigma_2\sigma_1 \vDash (K\sigma_2\sigma_1)[\tau]$$

By inductive hypothesis, $(l:\psi'\sigma_2)\cdot\Delta\sigma_2\sigma_1 \vDash (K\sigma_2\sigma_1)[\tau] \Downarrow_{C_2}$ holds. Because of this, and since $(l:!\alpha.(\psi'\sigma_2))\cdot\Delta\sigma_2\sigma_1 \vDash (K\sigma_2\sigma_1)\rho!T_c \rightarrow_{C_2} (l:\psi'\sigma_2)\cdot\Delta\sigma_2\sigma_1 \vDash (K\sigma_2\sigma_1)[\tau]$ is the only transition allowed by the abstract interpretation semantics, it follows that $\big((l:\psi)\cdot\Delta\big)\sigma_2\sigma_1 \vDash K[\rho!T]\sigma_2\sigma_1 \Downarrow_{C_2}$ holds, which proves the lemma.

– The other cases for $\rho!T$, $\rho?T$, $\rho!L_k$, $\rho?L_k$, $\rho!\rho_d$ and $\rho?l_d$ are all proved similarly, except for this case:

$$\begin{array}{l}\mathcal{MC}\big((l:!\eta_d.\eta)\cdot(l_d:\eta'_d)\cdot\Delta\vDash\rho!\rho_d,\ C,\ K\big)=(\sigma_2\sigma_1,C_2)\\ \quad\text{if}\quad C\vdash l\sim\rho\ \text{and}\ C\vdash l_d\sim\rho_d\\ \quad\text{and}\ (\sigma_1,C_1)=\ \mathsf{sub}(\eta'_d,\eta_d,C)\\ \quad\text{and}\ (\sigma_2,C_2)=\mathcal{MC}\big((l:\eta)\cdot\Delta\sigma\vDash\tau,\ C_1,\ K\sigma_1\big)\end{array}$$

The only difference with the previous case is that we have to prove that $C'\vdash\eta_{d'}\sigma<:\eta_d\sigma$, which follows by Lem. E.1.

– Suppose that the following $\mathcal{MC}$ clause has been applied:

$$\begin{array}{l}--\ \textit{sequencing}\\ \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta\vDash b_1\,;b_2,\ C,\ K\big)=\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta\vDash b_1,\ C,\ b_2\cdot K\big)\end{array}$$

The lemma is proved directly by inductive hypothesis.

– Suppose that the following $\mathcal{MC}$ clause has been used:

$$\begin{array}{l}--\ \textit{internal choice in the behavior}\\ \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta\vDash b_1\oplus b_2,\ C,\ K\big)=(\sigma_2\sigma_1,C_2)\\ \quad\text{if}\quad(\sigma_1,C_1)=\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta\vDash b_1,\ C,\ K\big)\\ \quad\text{and}\ (\sigma_2,C_2)=\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta\sigma_1\vDash b_2\sigma_1,\ C_1,\ K\sigma_1\big)\end{array}$$

This case is proved by Lem. D.10, inductive hypothesis and Prop. E.1.

Soundness of Algorithm $\mathcal{SI}$ can be stated as follows:

Theorem E.2 (Soundness of Algorithm $\mathcal{SI}$). *Let C be a well-formed constraints set. If $\mathcal{SI}(b,C)=(\sigma_1,C_1)$, then $\epsilon\vDash b\sigma_1\Downarrow_{C_1}$.*

Proof. The definition of Algorithm $\mathcal{SI}$ is:

$$\begin{array}{l}\mathcal{SI}(b,\ C)=(\sigma_2\sigma_1,\ C_2)\\ \quad\text{if}\quad(\sigma_1,C_1)=\mathcal{MC}\big(\epsilon\vDash b,\ C,\ \epsilon\big)\\ \quad\text{and}\ (\sigma_2,C_2)=\mathsf{choiceVarSubst}\ C_1\end{array}$$

By definition of $\mathsf{choiceVarSubst}$, $C_2=C_1\sigma_2$, which implies $C_2\vdash C_1\sigma_2$. The theorem follows directly by soundness of $\mathcal{MC}$, i.e. Prop. E.1, and by Lem. D.10, since $\epsilon\equiv\epsilon$ holds.

F Completeness of Algorithm $\mathcal{SI}$

Lemma F.1. *If $C\vdash C'\sigma$ and $\forall\psi.C\vdash\sigma(\psi)<:\sigma'(\psi)$, then $C\vdash C'\sigma'$.*

Proof. By structural induction on constraints over β, c, ψ_{in} and ψ_{ex}.

Lemma F.2 (Completeness of sub). *Let η and η' be well-formed in C and $C_0\sigma$. If $C\vdash\eta_1\sigma<:\eta_2\sigma$ and $C\vdash C_0\sigma$, then $\mathsf{sub}(\eta_1,\eta_2,C_0)=(\sigma_1,C_1)$ terminates, and there exists a substitution σ' such that $\forall\psi\in dom(\sigma).C\vdash\sigma(\psi)<:\sigma'(\sigma_1(\psi))$ and $C\vdash C_1\sigma'$.*

Proof. By structural induction on η_1. Let $\eta_1' = \eta_1\sigma$ and $\eta_2' = \eta_2\sigma$ be such that $C \vdash \eta_1' <: \eta_2'$.

If η_1 is a variable ψ_1, then sub terminates at line 52 with $\sigma_1 = [\psi_1 \mapsto \eta_2]$ and $C_1 = C_0\sigma_1$, regardless of the shape of η_2. Moreover σ can be decomposed into $\sigma = [\psi_1 \mapsto \eta_1'] \cdot \sigma''$ for some σ''. The lemma is proved by taking $\sigma' = \sigma''$, because $C \vdash \sigma(\psi) <: \sigma'(\sigma_1(\psi))$ holds for all $\psi \in dom(\sigma)$: for $\psi = \psi_1$ we have $\sigma(\psi_1) = \eta_1'$, which is a subtype of $\sigma'(\sigma_1(\psi)) = \sigma'(\eta_2) = \eta_2'$ by hypothesis; for any other ψ, $\sigma(\psi)$ and $\sigma'(\psi)$ are equal by definition. Moreover $C \vdash C_1\sigma'$ follows by Lem. F.1.

If η_1 is a session of the form $!T_1.\eta_1''$, then either $\eta_2 = \psi_2$, or $\eta_2 = !T_2.\eta_2''$ with $C \vdash T_2 <: T_1$ holding by definition of subtyping. The first case is proved similarly to the case for $\eta_1 = \psi_1$, but using the clause at line 53. The second case is proved by inductive hypothesis, since sub in this case only adds a new constraint $\{T_2 \subseteq T_1\}$ to C_0 in the clause at line 5. The proof for the case $\eta_1 = ?T_1.\eta''$ is proved similarly at line 8, considering that session sub-typing is covariant instead of contravariant. When $\eta_1 = !\eta_{1d}.\eta_1''$ and $\eta_2 \neq \psi_2$, the inner clauses at line 13 terminates by inductive hypothesis, and the lemma is proved similarly by transitivity of the session subtyping relation and of constraint refinement. Similarly, when $\eta_1 = ?\eta_{1r}.\eta_1''$ and $\eta_2 \neq \psi_2$, the clauses at line 16 terminate by inductive hypothesis and the proof is by inductive hypothesis and transitivity too. When $\eta_1 = \psi_{\mathsf{in}1}$ and $\eta_2 \neq \psi_2$, the lemma is proved by a induction on the size of the internal choice indexes I_2, where $\eta_2 = \psi_{\mathsf{in}2}$ and $\psi_{\mathsf{in}2} \sim \oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in I_2}$ holds. Similarly, when $\eta_1 = \psi_{\mathsf{ex}1}$ and $\eta_2 \neq \psi_2$, then $\eta_2 = \psi_{\mathsf{ex}2}$ and $\psi_{\mathsf{ex}2} \sim \&\{L_j : \eta_j\}_{j \in (J_1, J_2)}$ hold, and the proof follows by induction on the size of $J_1 \cup J_2$ over the inner call to function f.

The completeness of Algorithm $\mathcal{SI}$ relies on the completeness of Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$, stated as follows:

Theorem F.1 (Completeness of Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$). *Let $\Delta \vDash K[b]$ be well-formed in C and in $C_0\sigma$. If $(\Delta \vDash K[b])\sigma \Downarrow_C$ and $C \vdash C_0\sigma$, then there exists σ' such that $\mathcal{MC}(\Delta \vDash b, C_0) = (\sigma_1, C_1)$ terminates, $\forall \psi \in dom(\sigma).C \vdash \sigma(\psi) <: \sigma'(\sigma_1(\psi))$ and $C \vdash C_1\sigma'$*

Proof. The lemma is proved by induction of the lexicographic order between the execution size $|\Delta\sigma_1 \vDash K[b]\sigma_1|_{C_1}$ and length of a behavior b (i.e. structural induction).

Base case. The base case is when the execution size is equal to 1, that is, when $[\![\Delta \vDash K[b]\sigma]\!]_C = \{\Delta \vDash K[b]\sigma\}$, and $\Delta \vDash K[b]\sigma \not\rightarrow_C$. Since $\Delta \vDash K[b]\sigma$ is strongly normalizing by hypothesis, then $\Delta = \epsilon$ and $K[b] = \tau$, which implies that $K = \epsilon$ and $b = \tau$. In such a case, the clause $\mathcal{MC}(\epsilon \vDash \tau, C_0, \epsilon) = (\sigma_{id}, C_0)$ at line 5 terminates trivially. The lemma is proved by taking $\sigma' = \sigma$, because $\sigma'(\sigma_{id}(\psi)) = \sigma'(\psi) = \sigma(\psi)$ for any ψ and therefore $C \vdash \sigma(\psi) <: \sigma'(\sigma_1(\psi))$ holds by reflexivity, and because $C \vdash C_0\sigma_{id} = C_0$ holds by hypothesis.

Inductive case. In the inductive case, the execution size $|\Delta\sigma \vDash K[b]\sigma|_C$ is greater than 1, and therefore there exists a configuration $\Delta' \vDash b'$ such that

$\Delta\sigma \vDash K[b]\sigma \to_C \Delta' \vDash b'$ holds. It is easy to show that $\Delta\sigma \vDash K[b]\sigma \to_C \Delta' \vDash b'$ holds if and only if b is a , push We proceed by rule induction:

End: Suppose that Rule End has been used:

$$(l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta\sigma \vDash K[b]\sigma \to_C \Delta\sigma \vDash K[b]\sigma$$

There are two cases to consider: either $\Delta = (l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta'$, or $\Delta = (l : \psi) \cdot \Delta'$ and $\psi\sigma = \mathsf{end}$. In the first case, the clause $\mathcal{MC}\big((l : \mathsf{end}) \cdot \Delta \vDash b,\ C_0,\ K\big) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ C_0,\ K\big)$ and the lemma is proved by the inductive hypothesis. In the second case, we need to show that $\mathcal{MC}\big((l : \psi) \cdot \Delta \vDash b,\ C_0,\ K\big)$ terminates; this can be proved by structural induction on $K[b]$. If $b = \tau$ and $K = \epsilon$, then $\mathcal{MC}$ terminates by applying $\mathsf{finalize}$ on Δ, and the proposition is proved as in the base case. If $b = \tau$ and $K \neq \epsilon$, then the proposition is proved by inductive hypothesis on the clause at line 9.
If $b = \mathsf{push}(l : \eta')$, then $\mathsf{checkFresh}$ closes ψ in the clause at line 12, because a well-formed stack cannot push the same label l twice. In all other cases either the proposition follows by induction, or $K[b]$ must have the form of a operation. In the latter case, l cannot be contained in region ρ of the operation by well-formedness of the stack, and therefore the only applicable clause in the last one at line 120, that calls $\mathsf{closeTop}$.

Push: Suppose that the following transition is taken:

$$\Delta\sigma \vDash (K[\mathsf{push}(l : \eta)])\sigma \to_C (l : \eta\sigma) \cdot \Delta\sigma \vDash K[\tau] \qquad \text{if } l \sharp \Delta$$

We first need to show that $\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash \mathsf{push}(l : \eta),\ C_0,\ K\big)$ terminates. Suppose that the frames with closed sessions end are removed from the top of the stack, as in the case for End. The first clause that matches $\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash \mathsf{push}(l : \eta),\ C_0,\ K\big)$ is the one at line 12. By hypothesis $l \sharp \Delta$ holds, therefore the inner call to $\mathsf{checkFresh}$ can only return the identity substitution. Therefore $\sigma_1 = \sigma_{id}$ and $\Delta_1 = \Delta$ hold, and there exists a substitution σ'' such that the starting substitution σ can be split in the composition of σ_1 and σ'', i.e. $\sigma = \sigma''\sigma_1 = \sigma''$. The lemma is then proved by inductive hypothesis on the inner call to $\mathcal{MC}$ with the smaller configuration $(l : (\eta\sigma_1)\sigma'') \cdot (\Delta_1\sigma_1)\sigma'' \vDash \tau = (l : \eta\sigma) \cdot \Delta\sigma \vDash \tau$.

Out: Let $(\Delta \vDash K[b])\sigma = (l : !T.\eta\sigma) \cdot \Delta'\sigma \vDash \rho!T'$, and suppose that the following transition is taken:

$$(l : !T.\eta\sigma) \cdot \Delta'\sigma \vDash K[\rho!T'] \to_C (l : \eta\sigma) \cdot \Delta'\sigma \vDash K[\tau] \quad \text{if } C \vdash \rho \sim l,\ \mathit{pure}(T'),\ T' <: T$$

We must consider two cases: $\Delta = (l : \psi) \cdot \Delta'$ and $\sigma(\psi) = !T.\eta$, or $(l : !T.\eta) \cdot \Delta'$. In the first case the call to $\mathcal{MC}\big((l : \psi) \cdot \Delta' \vDash \rho!T',\ C_0,\ K\big)$ is matched by the clause at line 17, and it produces the substitution $\sigma_1 = [\psi \mapsto !\alpha.\psi']$ and a new constraint $T' \subseteq \alpha$ by definition, where ψ' and α' are fresh variables. By hypothesis σ has the form $[\psi \mapsto !T.\eta']$, and it can be decomposed into $\sigma'' = [\psi \mapsto !T.\psi']$ and $\sigma''' = [\psi' \mapsto \eta']$. The lemma is proved by applying the inductive hypothesis on the inner call to $\mathcal{MC}$ and by taking $\sigma' = \sigma'''[\alpha \mapsto T]$,

since σ'' can be further decomposed into σ_1 and $[\alpha \mapsto T]$ and therefore the substitution $[\alpha \mapsto T]$ guarantees that $\sigma'\sigma_1 = \sigma$; therefore $\forall \psi \in dom(\sigma).C \vdash \sigma(\psi) <: \sigma'(\sigma_1(\psi))$ follows by reflexivity. Notice that $C \vdash C_1\sigma'$ holds too by definition of constraints refinement, because the new constraint $T' \subseteq \alpha\sigma$ becomes $T' \subseteq T$ when $\sigma' = \sigma'''[\alpha \mapsto T]$ is applied to it, and because $C \vdash T' <: T$ holds by hypothesis from the side-conditions on Rule Out.
If $\Delta = (l : !T.\eta) \cdot \Delta'$, then the call $\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash \rho!T',\ C_0,\ K\big)$ is matched by the clause at line 22. The lemma is proved straightforwardly by taking $\sigma' = \sigma$, since Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ returns the identity substitution in this case.

In: This case is proved similarly to [Out], using the clauses at lines 26 and 31, recalling that session sub-typing is covariant instead of contravariant for inputs.

Del: This case is proved similarly to [Out], using the clauses at lines 35 and 37, together with Lem. F.2 in the latter case. Notice that $l_d \sim \rho_d$ holds by hypothesis, and therefore the clause at line 42 is not applicable.

Res: This case is proved similarly to [Out], using the clauses at lines 51 and 56. Notice that the clause at line 59 cannot be called, because the labels in the behavior $b = \rho?l_r$ match the label in the stack Δ by hypothesis.

ICh: Let $(\Delta \vDash K[b])\sigma = (l : \psi_{\mathsf{in}}) \cdot \Delta'\sigma \vDash K\sigma[\rho!L_j]$, and suppose that the following transition is taken:

$$(l : \underset{i \in I}{\oplus}\{L_i : \eta_i\}) \cdot \Delta' \vDash K\sigma[\rho!L_k] \rightarrow_C (l : \eta_k) \cdot \Delta' \vDash K\sigma[\tau] \quad \text{if } (j \in I),\ C \vdash \rho \sim l$$

There are two cases to consider: either $\Delta = (l : \psi) \cdot \Delta'$, or $\Delta = (l : \psi_{\mathsf{in}}) \cdot \Delta'$.
If $\Delta = (l : \psi) \cdot \Delta'$, then the only clause that matches the call to $\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b,\ K,\ C_0\big)$ is the one at line 64. Since $\psi\sigma = \psi_{\mathsf{in}}$, substitution σ can be decomposed as $\sigma = \sigma'[\psi \mapsto \psi_{\mathsf{in}}]$. Moreover $C \vdash \psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in J}$ and $k \in J$ hold by the side conditions of Rule ICh. Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ first produces the substitution $\sigma_1 = [\psi \mapsto \psi_{\mathsf{in}}]$, and introduces a new constraint $\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \oplus\{L_i : \psi_i\}_{i \in \{k\}}$ in C_0, where ψ_k is a fresh variable. Let $\sigma'' = \sigma'[\psi_k \mapsto \eta_k]\sigma_1$. Since $(l : \psi) \cdot \Delta' \vDash K\sigma''[\rho L_k] \Downarrow_C$ holds by hypothesis, and since $((l : \psi_k) \cdot \Delta' \vDash K[\tau]) = (l : \eta_k) \cdot \Delta'\sigma'\sigma_1 \vDash K\sigma'\sigma_1[\tau]$ holds because ψ_k is a fresh variable, then $(l : \eta_k) \cdot \Delta'\sigma'\sigma_1 \vDash K\sigma'\sigma_1[\tau] \Downarrow_C$ holds too. Moreover, since $C \vdash C_0\sigma$ holds by hypothesis and $C \vdash \psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in J}$ where J contains k both hold by the side condition of Rule ICh, then $C \vdash C_0\sigma'' \cup \{\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \subseteq \psi_k\sigma''\}$ holds too, because by definition of constraint refinement and of session sub-typing $C \vdash \oplus\{L_j : \eta_j\}_{j \in J} <: \oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in \{k\}}$. Therefore the inductive hypothesis applies to the inner call of $\mathcal{MC}\big((l : \psi_k) \cdot \Delta' \vDash \tau,\ K,\ C_0 \cup \{\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \subseteq \psi_k\}\big)$, and which also proves the theorem, since ψ_k is not in the domain of σ.
In the case that $\Delta = (l : \psi_{\mathsf{in}}) \cdot \Delta'$, then C_0 must contain a constraint $\psi_{\mathsf{in}} \sim \oplus\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in I}$ by definition of constraint well-formedness. There are two sub-cases to consider: either k is in I, or it is not. In the former case the theorem is proved straightforwardly by inductive hypothesis on the inner clause at line 69. If k is not in I, then the only applicable clause of Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ is the one at line 73, which adds k to ψ_{in}, and the theorem follows by inductive hypothesis on the inner call to $\mathcal{MC}$ with the extended internal choice.

ECH: Suppose that the following transition is taken:

$$(l : \&\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in (I_1, I_2)}) \cdot \Delta \vDash \&_{j \in J}\{\rho ? L_j ; b_j\} \to_C (l : \eta_k) \cdot \Delta \vDash b_k \quad \text{if } k \in J,\ C \vdash \rho \sim l,\ I_1 \subseteq J \subseteq I_1 \cup I_2$$

The proof of this case is similar to the proof for Rule ICH: if $\Delta = (l : \psi) \cdot \Delta'$, then Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ terminates by applying the clause at line 78, which first creates a new constraint on ψ_{ex}, and then recursively calls the clause at line 89, which is proved by inductive hypothesis and transitivity of session sub-typing. If $\Delta = (l : \&\{L_i : \eta_i\}_{i \in (I_1, I_2)}) \cdot \Delta'$, then either the clause at line 84 is called, in case either some labels in J from the behavior are missing from I_1 or I_2, or in case the active labels in I_1 are more than the labels in J; or the clause at line 89 is called, in case the session type designated by ψ_{ex} contains all the labels Jin the behavior, and the active labels I_1 are included in J. In the former case the constraint in the session type are adjusted appropriately and the theorem is proved as in the first case, because the clause at line 89 is the only clause that matches the adjusted session type. In the latter case the proof is by inductive hypothesis and transitivity as in the first case.
84 89

SPN: Suppose that the following transition is taken:

$$\Delta \vDash K[\mathsf{spawn}\, b] \to_C \Delta \vDash K[\tau] \qquad \text{if } \epsilon \vDash b \Downarrow_C$$

Assume that the frames with closed sessions end are removed from the top of the stack, as in the case for END, resulting in a stack Δ'. The clause $\mathcal{MC}(\Delta' \vDash \mathsf{spawn}\, b,\ K,\ C_0)$ is matched at line 105. Since $\epsilon \vDash b$ and $\Delta' \vDash K[\tau]$ are smaller configurations than $\Delta' \vDash \mathsf{spawn}\, b$, the theorem follows by inductive hypothesis and transitivity of session sub-typing.

REC: This case is proved similarly to the case for Rule SPN, with the exception that the clause at line 110 is called, and that the environment C_0 is properly manipulated to swap the recursive constraint $\mathsf{rec}_b\, \beta \subseteq \beta$ with $\tau \subseteq \beta$.

PLUS: Suppose that the following transition is taken:

$$\Delta \vDash K[b_1 \oplus b_2] \to_C \Delta \vDash K[b_i] \qquad \text{if } i \in \{1, 2\}$$

Assume that the frames with closed sessions end are removed from the top of the stack, as in the case for END. The only applicable clause in this case is the one at line 100. The inductive hypothesis can be applied directly on the first inner call to $\mathcal{MC}$, which implies that σ can be refined into $\sigma'\sigma_1$. By inductive hypothesis, $C \vdash \sigma(\psi) <: \sigma'(\sigma_1(\psi))$ holds for all ψ in the domain of σ. Notice that, by construction of algorithms sub and $\mathcal{MC}$, $\sigma'\sigma_1$ produces super types only in the case of delegation, therefore it is easy to show that $(\Delta \vDash K[b_1 \oplus b_2)\sigma'\sigma_1 \Downarrow_C$ holds as well. Therefore $(\Delta \vDash K[b_2)\sigma'\sigma_1 \Downarrow_C$ holds too, and the theorem is proved by the inductive hypothesis.

BETA: Suppose that the following transition is taken:

$$\Delta\sigma \vDash \beta\sigma \to_C \Delta\sigma \vDash b \qquad \text{if } C \vdash b \subseteq \beta$$

Since $\Delta \vDash \beta\sigma$ is well-formed in both C and $C_0\sigma$, variable β is constrained not only in C (by assumption $C \vdash b \subseteq \beta$ holds), but it is also constrained to some b' in $C_0\sigma$, i.e. $C_0\sigma \vdash b' \subseteq \beta\sigma$. By definition of constraint refinement, $C \vdash C_0\sigma$ implies that $b' = b\sigma$, because there is no sub-typing relation defined for behaviors, therefore $b\sigma$ and b' must be equal. The lemma is then proved directly by inductive hypothesis.

Assume that the frames with closed sessions end are removed from the top of the stack, as in the case for End. If the top of the stack in Δ is not end, the only applicable clause is the one at line 116, whereby $\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash \beta,\ C_0,\ K\big) = \mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b_0,\ C_0,\ K\big)$ with $b_0 = \bigoplus\{b_i \mid \exists i.\ (b_i \subseteq \beta) \in C\}$. By definition of $\mathcal{MC}$, the only clause that matches the inner call $\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta \vDash b_0,\ C_0,\ K\big)$ is the clause for internal choice at line 100. Since the execution size of $\Delta\sigma \vDash \beta\sigma$ is greater than the execution size of each $\Delta\sigma \vDash b_i\sigma$ component, the proof follows by inductive hypothesis, in the same way as for Rule Plus.

Seq: Suppose that the following transition is taken:

$$\Delta \vDash K[b_1; b_2] \rightarrow_C \Delta' \vDash K[b_1'; b_2] \qquad \text{if } \Delta \vDash b_1 \rightarrow_C \Delta' \vDash b_1'$$

Assume that all closed end sessions are removed from Δ, resulting in Δ', as for the case End. The clause $\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta' \vDash b_1; b_2,\ K,\ C_0\big)$ becomes $\mathcal{MC}\big(\Delta' \vDash b_1,\ b_2 \cdot K,\ C_0\big)$ at line 97, and the lemma is proved by inductive hypothesis, because the execution size of $\Delta' \vDash K[b_1; b_2]$ is equal to the execution size of $\Delta' \vDash b_2 \cdot K[b_1]$, but the size of b_1 is smaller than the size of $b_1; b_2$.

Tau: Suppose that the following transition is taken:

$$\Delta \vDash K[\tau; b] \rightarrow_C \Delta \vDash K[b]$$

Assuming that all closed session are removed from Δ as in the case for End and that a stack Δ' is returned, the clause at line 97 is called first, whereby b_2 is pushed on the stack K. Then the clause at line 9 is called recursively, whereby the τ behavior is discarded and b_2 is popped back from the stack. The lemma follows by inductive hypothesis on the smaller configuration $\Delta' \vDash K[b_2]$.

Completeness for session type inference can be stated as follows:

Theorem F.2 (Session type inference completeness). *Let $\epsilon \vDash b\sigma^\star$ and $C^\star$ be well-formed. If $\epsilon \vDash b\sigma^\star \Downarrow_{C^\star}$ and $C^\star \vdash C$, then $\mathcal{SI}(b, C) = (\sigma_1, C_1)$ and there exists σ such that $C^\star \vdash C_1\sigma$ and $\forall\psi \in dom(\sigma^\star).C \vdash \sigma^\star(\psi) \subseteq \sigma\sigma_1(\psi)$.*

Proof. The proof follows by applying Proposition F.1 on the configuration $\epsilon \vDash b$ under C first. Algorithm $\mathcal{MC}$ returns σ_1 and C_1 such that there exists a σ' such that $C \vdash \sigma^\star(\psi) \subseteq \sigma'\sigma_1(\psi)$ for any ψ in the domain of $\sigma^\star$, and $C \vdash C_1\sigma'$. Since the call to $\mathsf{choiceSubst}$ simply substitutes ψ_{in} and ψ_{ex} variables with their (unique) relative internal and external choices in C_1, the new substitution σ_2 and C_2 that this function returns does not change the typing of sessions, and therefore $\forall\psi \in dom(\sigma).C \vdash \sigma(\psi) <: \sigma'(\sigma_2(\sigma_1(\psi)))$ holds, and $C \vdash C_2\sigma'$ follows by $C \vdash C_1\sigma'$, which proves the lemma.